

# BACONIANA

VOL. XXXVIII (69th Year)

No. 150

DECEMBER, 1954

---

*It should be clearly understood that BACONIANA is a medium for the discussion of subjects connected with the Objects of the Society, but the Council does not necessarily endorse opinions expressed by contributors.*

---

## EDITORIAL

THE number of this issue—150—marks another point of progress in the activities of the Francis Bacon Society. A babe among literary societies when it was born in 1885, it has now a good record. There have been lean years (such as 1918, 1920 and 1921) when the annual issues of BACONIANA fell to but one; but whether this was due to lack of funds, lack of material, or a lapse of editorial attention, it is not easy to say. Two thick double numbers in the spring and autumn of 1917 suggest that matter was available, but that economies in printing were being tried. The early BACONIANAS between 1903 and 1918, are well set up and make very good reading. We hope that one of our members will one day find time to write an article or two on the genesis of the Society and its developing lines of thought. Meanwhile, the offer to consider application for a limited number of back numbers at the reduced price of 1/- each (plus postage) remains open until April 1955 when the price will again revert to normal.

The reason for this offer, as we have said before, is to encourage those who are interested in acquiring fairly extensive "runs" of the magazine, if not full collections. Our stock has suffered inevitable loss and damage in the course of two world wars and various removals. We should like to think that a number of private collections exist, especially in America, and English speaking communities beyond the seas.

Turning over the pages of back numbers of BACONIANA, we are reminded of many energetic and skilful writers of the past, some of whose names are still represented in our membership roll. Mr. Sidney Woodward, whose father and uncle, Frank and Parker Woodward, gave so much of their time to the Society, has just resigned the Honorary Presidency in favour of Mr. Edward Johnson, whose prolific pen and determined character have just furnished us with another most interesting booklet *Will Shakspeare of Stratford*. Mr. Johnson, as an experienced lawyer, must be well aware just how far he can go in denouncing fraudulence. Nevertheless we are rather surprised that there has been no effort, either on the part of the Shakespeare Trust or of academic scholarship in general, to refute his statements. As

usual the "gauntlet", so often thrown down, is not taken up. We are confident that our readers will join with us in welcoming Mr. Johnson's appointment as Hon. President, and that they will also note with satisfaction Mr. Woodward's name as a past President and as Chairman of the Council.

\* \* \* \*

Reverting once again to the question of our perpetually disregarded challenges to the orthodox, it is interesting to recall that the suppression of truth, for reasons of expediency, has ever been a major obstacle to those whose aim was to further the mental growth of the nation. There has always been this antagonism, and it was largely to evade the restrictions of a despotic rule that Sidney, Raleigh, Bacon and others reverted to cryptography, enfolded writings, emblems and other peculiar forms of literature. There were of course additional reasons for this apparent duplicity in methods of "tradition and delivery" for, as Bacon clearly says, "parables serve to *instruct* and to *illustrate* as well as to *wrap up* and *conceal*." But we are concerned here with the principal need to evade suppression of the truth, in his day and ours.

Sir Walter Raleigh is said to have tried to set up an Office of Address. "An Office of Address whereby the wants of all may be made known to all, where men may know what is already done in the business of learning, and what is at present doing . . . to the end that the wits of the world may no longer be as so many scattered coals, which for want of union are soon quenched, whereas being laid together they would have yielded a comfortable light and heat."<sup>1</sup> It is also recorded that Sir Walter Raleigh, together with Lord Cobham, Fortescue and others, would have obliged King James to "Articles" before he was admitted to the throne.<sup>2</sup>

We take occasion to mention these points because, in lesser degree, they still apply. An unpopular theory, however true, can still be suppressed by those who control publication. In three and a half centuries we have only advanced a very small step. You can now say or write what you like, but those who control the Press and the radio can virtually decide whether you are heard or not! Recently a friend of the present writer, himself a small publisher, tried to re-open the road to the mental freedom that Bacon and Raleigh had envisaged. The idea was ingenious. It consisted of an annual publication entitled "The Editor Regrets", or "Unprinted Letters to the National Press." Any correspondent whose letter had been suppressed, when his arguments were justifiable or his forecast correct, could claim a hearing. It can be imagined what pressure was brought to bear in order to crush this plan; for by it any newspaper editor, who deliberately suppressed a reasonable letter, would have to face exposure, and the public would thus be made aware of what the newspapers wanted to suppress.

As will be seen from the following extract from the *Sunday Express* of October 3rd, 1954, confirmation of the so-called Baconian "heresy" sometimes comes through the most unexpected channels.

<sup>1</sup>Oldys

<sup>2</sup>Osborne



"ON BROADWAY IT'S ROMEO . . . BY BACON"

"I have to tell you what they are planning to do with that film of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* (in addition to what Castellani has already done).

Richard Condon, executive and researcher for the company distributing the film in America, says:—'The Rank Organisation haven't billed Shakespeare in their advertising. Neither will we. My researches convince me he didn't write the play. We are planning to bill it as *Romeo and Juliet*—by Sir Francis Bacon.'

I suspect this is an attempt to whip up controversy about the film which cost more than £750,000 and which hasn't set the British box offices on fire.

So the American slogan may become 'We Bill Bacon—Not Will.' I'm afraid".

Since the date of this announcement our Society has been contacted by Suzanne Warner Ltd. who are engaged in promoting and publicising the distribution of this excellent film. Two members of the Council who happened to be available were invited by Miss Suzanne Warner to witness a private screening of this film "*Romeo and Juliet*" at a Wardour Street studio. They were both impressed by the power and beauty of the performance; and one of them, who had been lately reading *Romeo and Juliet. An Esoteric Interpretation*, by our fellow member Mrs. Beryl Pogson, was struck by the added interest which a previous reading of that little booklet afforded. As usual the film version contains certain cuts, probably to enhance the dramatic effect. We rather missed the pale and poverty-stricken apothecary and his quaint conversation with Romeo in a street of Mantua. And Romeo dies by his own stiletto and not by a lethal drug. This arrangement tends, of course, to simplify the play, in which most of the lines are beautifully and clearly spoken.

We are not yet quite clear as to the full reasons for this unusual attitude of the Rank organisation regarding the authorship of *Romeo and Juliet*. Our next issue may contain more information on this point. For the present we learn from Miss Suzanne Warner herself that, owing to the pressure which has been brought to bear, the proposed billing of the Play as by "Francis Bacon" has been dropped, and the film will be billed anonymously in New York, as in fact it has been in London.

\* \* \* \*

We would like now to refer to three excellent new booklets:

Mr. Edward Johnson's *Will Shakspeare of Stratford*, 5/-

Mr. R. L. Eagle's *Bacon or Shakspeare: A Guide for Beginners*, 3/6.

Mrs. Beryl Pogson's *Romeo and Juliet. An Esoteric Interpretation*.

The first of these has already been mentioned, but it remains to commend it as a most daring denunciation of "Stratfordian" propaganda.

Some of our members may have noticed an article by the well-

known journalist Mr. A. J. Cummings, which appeared in the *News Chronicle* on August 19th last, and which, by his kind permission, we reproduce on p.140. The article is interesting for the candour of the author's approach to the arguments so cogently advanced by our President, but we leave readers to form their own judgment on the concluding paragraph, perhaps remembering J. R. Lowell's lines. . . .

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,  
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side."

. . . The poet knew (as Bacon did), that the time was not ripe.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Eagle's booklet is a reprint of his three articles printed in the last three issues of *BACONIANA*. It is a sober and satisfying presentation of the case for Lord Bacon, and will form an invaluable handbook for those intending to give lectures or to take part in debates, as well as for newcomers to the controversy. Mr. Eagle very sensibly suggests that Members, when placing their orders, should buy extra copies to send to their local newspapers, asking for a review. Local branches of Messrs. W. H. Smith and Son might show half-a-dozen copies on request, taking a small commission on sales. The Secretary would be pleased to supply these as needed, for sale or return. Past experience seems to justify such initiative, and publication of notices in such journals as *The Scotsman*, *The Yorkshire Post*, *The East Anglian Daily Times* or the *Manchester Guardian*, would provide valuable publicity.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Pogson's booklet relates of course to the Philosophy and not to the Controversy, for some must leave the arena to enter the study. To those interested in the science of the soul (whether by way of Freemasonry, or theosophy, or Rosicrucianism, or psychiatry) this booklet will appeal. To read the plays of Shakespeare "in depth" is one of the crowning pleasures of the Baconian student. There are many subtleties in Shakespeare which are not designed for the theatre-goer, and which may sometimes hinder the dramatic effect. Some of them are the thumb-marks of the author; others are for students of the Ageless Wisdom. There is a mine of truth which will some day be reached by this process of imaginative interpretation.

We realise that this kind of study will not necessarily appeal to all our members. Probably it was this that prompted the author to publish her work independently. Nor do we ourselves subscribe to every interpretation which Mrs. Pogson puts on the words of the Play. But we do believe that this form of study is valuable, since it concentrates attention on points which otherwise would escape notice.

Past editors and critics of Shakespeare's works have a variety of methods for dealing with those parts of the text which appear incongruous. The insertion of "padding" and "horse-play" in order to "play to the gallery"—the work of the "unknown collaborator" whose pen is supposed to explain all eccentricities of style. There may often be truth in these explanations; but there are also times when an occult



or mystical interpretation shows clearly that the Author was not nodding.

It is hoped to review this booklet, together with Mrs. Pogson's collection of similar interpretations in "In The East my Pleasure Lies", in a subsequent issue.

\* \* \* \*

In a letter from the Librarian of Islington Central Library, and in Mr. R. L. Eagle's comments thereon, our readers will find confirmation that Canonbury Tower itself is Elizabethan, dating probably from 1562, and that many parts of the building were pulled down in 1770.

By whatever name the whole range of buildings was designated in Elizabethan days, it is now clear that it always possessed a "Tower"—now the only extant portion of the original structure. If Bacon, when he occupied the place, had wished to refer in particular to that part of it which constitutes the present Tower, it would not have been unreasonable to have called it "Canonbury Tower."

We must therefore continue to regard the allegations which Mr. Eagle brings against Mrs. Gallup as representing his own private opinion and not, as he suggests, proved.

\* \* \* \*

We are happy to print Part II of Mr. Gentry's able article on "Shakespeare and Italy." The following note from R. L. Eagle adds valuable supporting data to our contributor's contentions.

#### DID SHAKESPEARE KNOW SPANISH?

Professor Elze, writing of the description of the Spanish language found in *Love's Labour's Lost*, said:

Can one who describes the character of a language with such clearness and insight be unacquainted with it?

Shakespeare's knowledge of the Spanish language, and to what extent the people, literature, &c., of Spain interested him, is a subject which has never been given much attention.

On the surface there is little to be observed of Spanish influence in the plays. Actual use of Spanish is very small. We have in *Love's Labour's Lost* (v. 2) "fortuna de la guerra," "palabras" in *Much Ado About Nothing* (III. 5), and "pocas palabras" (which the tinker, Sly, in *Taming of the Shrew* distorts into "pauca pallabris").

What turned my interest to the subject was pausing over the name "Borachio" in *Much Ado*. This disreputable agent and spy of Don John admits he is drunk in Act II. 3. Now "Borracho" in Spanish means "tipsy." There is no "Borachio" in the Italian novel *Timbreo di Cardona* by Bandello, which is the main source of the play, yet Cardona is in Spain. Is the name to be found in any play or story in the Spanish language, or was it Shakespeare's own invention? In either case it shows that the poet *did* know some Spanish.

# A PIONEER

By M. P.

## I

**A** CENTURY it is since Delia Bacon, most quixotic of Shakespearean students, first tilted at the windmills of popular tradition. But the windmills and the gasworks were unmoved; and the factories of the Stratford tradition seem to have continued in full production. And Delia Bacon, disheartened by the world's reception of a cause which to her had become sacrosanct, has long since passed on. Her best work is forgotten, and only a final period of mental derangement is remembered.

Nevertheless her book though scarce is still extant, and remains the silent witness of great insight and painstaking industry. Devotion was her strongest virtue, and it is rare to find this coupled with so great a capacity for abstract thought. The world, in ignorance of Miss Bacon's work, and of the great personal impression she made on such men as Emerson, Carlyle and Hawthorne, has been led to dismiss her book unread. But it is surely idle to judge on a basis of ignorance and conjecture; and for this reason, although our main theme is a reconsideration of her theory, it is well to begin by recording something of her self.

This attractive New Englander seems to have quite captured the Carlyles, who at once made her welcome at their house in Cheyne Walk. "I pray you be not so shy of us," wrote the sage of Chelsea. Perhaps if she had been able to cultivate such friendships more closely, the end would have been different. Carlyle's worldly wisdom, though it blinded him to the merits of her cause, gave him a clearer apprehension of the inevitable disappointments which lay in store. "As for Miss Bacon," he writes to Emerson, "we find her, with her modest shy dignity, with her sound character and strange enterprise, a real acquisition, and we hope we shall now see more of her . . . . I have not in my life met anything so tragically quixotic as her Shakespeare enterprise; alas, alas there can be nothing but sorrow to it and utter disappointment in it for her. I do cheerfully what I can, which is far more than she asks, for I have not seen a prouder silent soul . . ."

Before she died in her native America, Delia Bacon was to dwell for nearly a year at Henley-in-Arden in the dark caverns of a disordered mind. Mercifully there came to her before the end a brief period of lucidity and of reconciliation with those she loved. That she lost her reason some time after her work was done, ought not to detract from her previous achievement. The conquest of a virgin mountain peak is not discounted by a later fall, and unbalance is a risk that all who climb the heights must take. True, those who worship only the calculating faculty would nowadays consign all poets and mystics to the con-



sulting-room of the psychiatrist ! But in the saner vision of the great author to whom Delia devoted her life:

*"The lunatic, the lover and the poet  
Are of imagination all compact . . ."*

Delia was a lover, a lover of the truth. We may be permitted therefore to draw aside the curtain after the lapse of a century, to do some measure of justice to her name and memory.

o \* \* \* \*

Whether her mission failed or succeeded will be for posterity to say. Certainly it is not for those who have never read her treatise; and this is truly of the one most extraordinary and most unreadable of books. As often as one lays it aside, bewildered by the declamatory style and long sentences crowded with new and provoking thought, one picks it up again to light upon some new gem of Shakespearian interpretation.

Even from its place on the shelf the book seems to exercise a strange fascination. Is there an element of prophecy in it? Did the author live before her time? Or did she merely bring to the business of Philosophy too much of the nature of the religious devotee? Perhaps there was an element of both these things.

It was curious that, with no knowledge of each other's works, Delia Bacon and W. H. Smith should have published their theories of the authorship of the Shakespeare Plays in the same year, 1857. These, in the modern and restricted sense of the word, were the first two "Baconian" books—*The Philosophy of the Shakespeare Plays* by Miss Bacon, and *Bacon and Shakespeare* by W. H. Smith. But whereas the former deals with the philosophic plan of a group of authors of whom Bacon is taken to be the chief, the latter deals mostly with external evidences of Baconian authorship. One relates to the Philosophy, the other to the Controversy; yet there was enough common ground to lead Nathaniel Hawthorne, in his preface to Miss Bacon's book, to accuse Smith of plagiarism. This accusation, since it was generously withdrawn, is also printed in the preface to the second issue of Mr. Smith's book.

It would be hard to find two writers of more opposite characteristics: Smith terse, matter-of-fact, unemotional; Miss Bacon (in spite of a greater intellectual range) impassioned, rhetorical and in some ways quite un-Baconian. But notwithstanding the vortex into which Delia Bacon was drawn, I believe it is she who has filed a key which may some day unlock one of the greatest of historical problems.

People who leave others to do their thinking for them are naturally prone to accept the orthodox view that unorthodoxy is lunacy. Probably it is for this reason that Delia's book has never been re-printed and is seldom seriously considered. Even more scarce is the well written biographical sketch by her relative, Theodore Bacon, to whom we are indebted for the extracts which follow. Let the reader please lay aside any previous views and reconsider a few of the facts. And let it also be remembered that, before Miss Bacon was admitted into a private mental home in the "Forest of Arden", she had previously received

nothing but kindness from those at Stratford-on-Avon with whom she lodged, and from the kindly Vicar of the Church to which she was so irresistibly drawn.

The following letter, written from her newly found lodgings in Stratford, affords us a glimpse of a rather charming personality. Addressed to Mrs. Hawthorne, wife of the American Consul in Liverpool, it is certainly the letter of a very sick woman, but in no sense the letter of a mad woman. It was written in the year preceding her breakdown, and we select and quote it at length because it contains very little suggestion of an *idée fixé*.

August 1859

"My dear Mrs. Hawthorne

"Twenty-four hours after I left London—alone and fearfully ill—not knowing hardly whither I went—I found myself lying on the sofa in the most perfect little paradise of neatness and comfort that you can possibly conceive of. If it had been invented on purpose, and dropped down out of the clouds to receive me at the end of my journey, it could not have been more exactly the place I wanted—with a dear good motherly lady to nurse me and take care of me, and no other creature in the house but her little servant who is all of a piece with it.

"It is not a lodging house. The owner of it lives on her rents and never took a lodger in her life before; but some person had heard that she thought of taking a friend of hers for company, and something had happened to prevent it, and she thought if she could find a lady to her mind, perhaps she would take one. I had stipulated for a place near the church, and this was mentioned in that connection.

"The only objects to be seen from my window as I write are the trees on the banks of the Avon and the church directly before me—only a few yards from here though I shall have to go about some to find access to it, I suppose. I took the old lady by storm. She was not at home when I arrived here. I had come in a 'fly' from the 'Red 'Orse' for I could have just as soon have forded the Atlantic Ocean as to have walked the short distance from my inn to this place.

"You must know I was so deadly ill that I could not get taken in at an ordinary lodging house. They thought from my appearance that I was going to die and that it would not be worth the trouble! . . . The moment I looked into this house I thought I saw that it was the place appointed for me, and ordered the porter to take off my luggage. The little handmaid seemed to have some misgivings, and once she came to the door and said timidly, "Do you know Mrs. Terrett?" I told her she need not give herself any trouble and that I would take all the blame for it.

"The kitchen was what finally decided me to stop. I walked into it and thought it was the prettiest place I ever saw. The walls were painted cerulean blue, and everything in it shone like gold. The little servant kept running upstairs and putting her head out of the window, and finally she reported that her mistress was coming. The moment I saw her kind countenance I was sure that I had not made a mistake. She was very much surprised of course—said that she had thought of such a thing but was not aware that she had named it to anyone. She saw that I was very ill, and that, I think, decided her not to send me away at least until I was better.

"We talked about the price. Two very nice rooms, good-sized and



well furnished—the front room and the room over it. She asked me if I thought, if she provided linen, etc.—if seven shillings would be too much for rent and attendance . . .

"So all was settled, and she made me lie down on the sofa and covered me up like a mother, and went off to prepare some refreshment for me immediately. And there I lay at two o'clock (the hour I left London on the day before) looking out on that church spire and those trees on the Avon, so near, so very near, and yet doubtful whether my feet would ever take me there . . .

"I have scarcely had a thought or an emotion since I left London. I am only an automaton obeying some further purpose, obeying rather the Power above that is working beneficently in all this. I have no anxiety, no care about it. I love to be here. Those beautiful trees and that church spire look a little like dream-land to me . . . I lie here as quiet and as helpless as a baby waiting on the Power that has brought me here, with no fear now that anything will fail which the opening of this new fountain of blessings for men requires to be done. I shall be here perhaps for months to come. To recover my health is now my only object. If that *can be* done, this I think is the place for it. The air is as pure as heaven and the calm after that noise for twenty months soothes me every moment."

This letter, and others in the same vein, were written while she was still awaiting the publication of her long completed book, then in printers' hands. It would therefore seem that the subsequent collapse was not due so much to the strain of writing as to an aftermath; too long had her mind been overtaxed and her body undernourished.

Before going further something must be said of Miss Bacon's childhood and upbringing. Of New England puritan stock, her family may be traced as far back as 1640, to one Michael Bacon, living at Dedham in the colony upon Massachussetts Bay. Although no definite connection with the family of the great Elizabethan was ever claimed, this was not impossible, for Michael was a man of property and a captain of the Yeomanry. In 1764 Joseph, great-great-grandson of the first Michael, went to live in Woodstock in Connecticut where, into the wandering life of a missionary and a preacher, was born David Bacon, father of Delia.

The idealistic and devotional nature which she may have inherited from her father, and which may well have been exaggerated by her surroundings, is in this way accountable. It was at David Bacon's rude log cabin, some thirty miles south of the present great city of Cleveland, that on February 2nd, 1811, there came into the world this strange and gifted child who was later to combine the fervour of the missionary and knight errant with a most unusual aptitude for dealing with abstract thought.

Her impressions of the wilderness which surrounded her childhood were recorded many years later in an unpublished historical paper on Sir Walter Raleigh. Of that newly discovered continent she writes in her peculiar involved style:

"the new power of Religious Protestantism would begin ere long to pierce the great inland forest; with its patient strength, sprinkling it with bright spots of European culture . . . where the mission hut

pursued the tomahawk, the "Great Trail" from the Northern Lakes to the Southern Gulf went by the door, and wild Indian faces looked in on the young mother, and wolves howled . . . and the wild old forest echoed with Sabbath hymnes and sweet old English nursery songs, and the children of the New World awoke . . ."

In his 46th year David Bacon died, leaving a large family without inheritance. It is not recorded how his young widow contrived to feed, clothe and educate her six children, enabling her two sons to pass through Yale College into learned professions. But it became necessary to find a home for Delia when she was six years old, where she evidently received much kindness "of a grim puritanical kind." In Hartford she went to a school for girls founded by Catharine Beecher who recognized, and years later recorded, the promising qualities of her pupil:

"If the writer were to make a list of the most gifted minds she had ever met, male or female, among the highest would stand five young maidens then grouped around the writer in that dawning experience of a teacher's life . . . Of this number one was the homeless daughter of a Western Missionary."

In the spring of 1826 at the age of fifteen Miss Bacon was obliged to look for a means of earning her own living. After two unsuccessful ventures in running a school, she and her sister established themselves at Jamaica in Long Island with better prospects. But this too came to an end in the summer of 1830 in disappointment, sickness and insolvency. Thereafter she seems to have abandoned the hazards of proprietorship, and to have maintained herself by teaching in the schools of others, and in taking private classes.

In 1831, in spite of the duties of teaching, she obtained anonymous publication of her first book *Tales of the Puritans*. And in the years that followed she seems to have made great efforts to extend her own education by intensive reading. Perhaps the next phase of her life is best described in the words of one who thought it a privilege to have been her pupil and who writes thus of her teaching:

"She imparted to them new ideas; she systemized for them the knowledge already gained; she engaged them in discussion; she taught them to think . . . Her pupils had no books—only a pencil and some paper. All they learned was received from her lips. She sat before them, her noble countenance lighted with enthusiasm, her fair white hands now holding a book from which she read an extract, now pressing for a moment the thoughtful brow. She knew both how to pour in knowledge and how to draw out thought . . .

"Graceful and intellectual in appearance, eloquent in speech, marvellously wise, and full of inspiration, she looked and spoke the very muse of history. Of those lectures she wrote out nothing—not even notes. All their wisdom came fresh and living from the depth of her ready intellect. And for that very reason there is now no trace of what would be so valuable.

"No one could know and appreciate Delia Bacon without placing her in his estimation among the most highly endowed women whom he ever saw or heard of. Was philosophy the subject of her discourse? She dealt with abstract truth as but one woman does in generations. Weighing, balancing, analyzing and comparing, she knew all systems,



and had their resemblances and their differences clearly defined, distinctly remembered, and ready at her call. Her mastery of the subject astonished you; you were sure she had given her chief time and thought to that alone.

"So with poetry and art. By her own originality and genius she set forth each with new thoughts, or with old ones in new combinations. And a deep veneration for what is good, a clear recognition of God and his providence underlay all her teachings."

It seems that for a number of years her courses of instruction were much esteemed. In New Haven, where her brother was a minister connected with Yale College, she had certain advantages of introduction. In Boston, in Cambridge, in New York and Brooklyn she continued, up to the years of 1852-53 her work of oral instruction. In the closing chapter of her *Recollections of Seventy Years* (1865) Mrs. E. Farrer completes the picture:

"She spoke without notes, entirely from her well stored memory; and she would so group her facts as to present to us historical pictures calculated to make a lasting impression . . . In these she brought down her history to the time of the birth of Christ, and I can never forget how clear she made it to us that the world was only then made fit for the advent of Jesus . . .

"In her Cambridge course she had maps, charts, models, pictures, and everything she needed to illustrate her subject. All who saw her then must remember how handsome she was and how gracefully she used her wand in pointing to the illustrations of her subject . . ."

and here a suggestion of what was to come—

"More and more indeed, through all this period of exhausting toil for self-support, under the burden of sickness and penury and debt, her interest and her inclination were turning toward pure literature and literary criticism; so that when, in 1852, her historical lectures in Cambridge and Boston were ended for the season, she seems to have hoped they would never be, as in fact they never were, resumed."

Before adverting to the main work of her life, which was the attempted elucidation of the Shakespeare mystery, Delia's biographer mentions a prolonged period of acute personal distress in the years 1846 and 1847, the exact nature of which is not disclosed. Thereafter we are told that, in studying and teaching history and literary criticism for many years, her mind became gradually fixed upon the greatest age of English Letters—the Elizabethan and Jacobean ages. After a prolonged period of consideration she first began to doubt, and finally to reject the title of Will Shakespeare to the authorship of the Plays, and to the Plays themselves, she attached a deeper meaning than usual.

The course of her life, never calm nor easy, had now reached the cross-roads. Did she, at this critical juncture (in the language of our critics) "imbibe the deadly virus of the Baconian heresy and the mad-house chatter of its preposterous theories"? Or is it possible that she deliberately gave up pursuit of subjects in which she was proficient to seek entry into that greater Kingdom of Knowledge into which, in Bacon's noble words, "no entry is conceded except as a little child"?

In the article that follows we shall be considering her book. These few biographical details, given to commemorate her in the annals of our Society, would probably have irritated her. It was the meaning, the "Soul", which alone engaged her attention. She chose solitude, privation, and life in a boarding house. She evaded the society and hospitality of eminent men of letters because she wished to devote herself, body and soul, to the cause she had espoused.

However necessary this may have been, I believe it was a pity. And, seeing that she had divined the secret purpose of Bacon's "Art of Delivery", and had recognised the underlying motive of the Shakespeare Plays, it is also a pity that she should have expected the world to accept a book on Abstract Philosophy which challenged most of the established beliefs of her day, but which did not (as did Lord Bacon in the Shakespeare Plays) come down to the level of ordinary mortals. She had understood and often quoted that famous passage in the *Advancement of Learning* on the uses of "Stage Plays and Poems" as a means of teaching mankind, especially those who, through no fault of their own, were chained in those days to the fields of the emotions and the senses.

*"But to speak the truth the best Doctors of this knowledge are the Poets and Writers of Histories, where we may find painted and dissected to the life, how affections are to be stirred up and kindled; how stilled and laid asleep; how again contained and refrained, that they break not forth into Act; likewise how they disclose themselves though repressed and secreted . . . How I say to set Affection against Affection, and by the help of one to master and reclaim another? After the manner of Hunters and Fowlers, who hunt beasts with beasts and fly bird with bird . . ."*

Observing that Delia Bacon had so well understood this passage, how could she hope that her own treatise would not fall, for the most part, on deaf ears? Why did she bury the jewel she had found in such a heap of abstruse verbiage? Was she by nature and by her own personal charm more of an Orator than a Writer? Or was she, as one of her letters suggests, simply obeying the dictates of a higher power and working, as did Bacon, "for posterity and the immortal God"?

*(to be continued)*



## STRATFORDIAN AND OTHER FRAUDS

By EDWARD D. JOHNSON

A Mrs. Hornby purchased the so-called "Birthplace" in 1775 and subsequently opened it as a museum of relics. The only relic that she had in 1777 was apparently an arm chair in which Shakspeare is supposed to have sat and smoked his pipe. Some time later a Russian princess bought the chair for twenty guineas and carried it off. Between 1790 and 1801, the chair seems to have been sold and replaced twenty times at least. It was on view when Washington Irving, the famous American, visited Stratford in 1807 but has now disappeared.

Mrs. Hornby got busy and collected a number of other relics such as Shakspeare's tobacco stopper, carved oak chests, part of a carved bedstead, an iron deed box, a sword, a lantern, a dice box, one of Mrs. Shakspeare's shoes, a glass goblet and the table at which Shakspeare wrote his great dramas!

Mr. R. B. Wheler, the historian of Stratford and author of the local Guide Book, mercilessly denounced all these relics, without exception, as "scandalous impositions", and said that it was well known at Stratford that there does not exist a single article that ever belonged to Shakspeare.

All these relics seem to have disappeared when in 1874 the so-called Birthplace was sold and administered under the terms of a Trust Deed on behalf of the nation. It then seems to have been refurnished with other relics. I do not know what is now exhibited but believe that they show the desk at which William sat at school. In Shakspeare's day, scholars did not have desks. They sat on a form with a raised table in front to work on. The size and shape of this desk is similar to that used by schoolmasters and never by pupils. If Shakspeare was ever at the Stratford Grammar School (of which there is no evidence whatsoever) it was an audacious proceeding on his part to carve his initials on his master's desk.

There also used to be a signet ring with the initials W.S. *engraved* on it which is supposed to have been found near the Parish Church in 1810. It seems that a labourer's wife walking through a *much frequented* mill close put her foot on the ring where it had apparently been lying undisturbed since Shakspeare died 194 years before.

In 1950 a great fuss was made because a tinder box was stated to have been discovered in a receptacle at the side of a fireplace at the Birthplace. It is difficult to understand this because of the house which originally stood on the site of the Birthplace nothing now remains but the cellars, and any fireplaces in the original house have long ago disappeared.

There is a tradition at Stratford that Shakspeare planted with his own hand a mulberry tree in the garden of New Place. The Revd.

Francis Gastrell purchased New Place in 1576 when the tree had grown so large that it shaded the windows of the house and it had also become so decayed that it was dangerous, so his wife ordered it to be felled. The tree was purchased at firewood prices by a Mr. Thomas Sharp (a very suitable name) who felled it and being a keen man of business used the timber to make snuff boxes, goblets, tooth pick cases, tobacco stoppers and numerous other articles, which he sold at a very handsome profit.

Mr. Washington Irving visiting Stratford in 1815, commented on the "extraordinary powers of self multiplication which the tree possessed," and in 1865, *fifty years afterwards*, Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps reported that the manufacture of small articles from the wood of the mulberry tree was still in full blast. There is no doubt that thousands of American homes possess something which they fondly imagine was carved from the wood of the original tree.

Which ought we to admire most? The fertility of the tales about the mulberry tree or the fertility of the tree itself?

Ann Hathaway's cottage at Shottery near Stratford-on-Avon is visited every year by a vast number of people who pay a fee for the privilege of inspecting the alleged home of Shakspeare's wife before her marriage.

*Two hundred and fourteen years* after Ann Hathaway was born, her maiden residence was utterly unknown. Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps who spent forty years of his life investigating anything connected with Shakspeare wrote "The official designation of these premises as the home of Shakspeare's bride is one of those lamentable attempts that have been made to deceive the world in all that relates to the great dramatist", and he further wrote, "There is unhappily no tradition indicating the birthplace of Shakespeare's Ann upon which the least reliance can be placed." Another authority, a close friend of Mr. Joseph Skipsey (who resigned his post as custodian of the Birthplace because as he said "the relics stank in his nostrils") says this: "The thousands of visitors who have been to Ann Hathaway's cottage under the impression that it is a Shakspeare shrine have been, in my opinion, labouring under a delusion. All the nonsense about "Ann Hathaway's bedroom", Anne Hathaway's window from which she looked to see William coming across the fields, Ann Hathaway's corner in the main room, where she and Shakspeare sat in their courting days, must be dismissed as the idlest of suppositions. There is not an iota of proof that Shakspeare ever entered the house. It is open to doubt if his wife was ever there.

The last Will and Testament of Will Shakspeare seems to have been filed by the Executors on 2nd June 1616 in the Prerogative Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury, afterwards known as "Doctors Commons". A perusal of this Will shows that someone has scratched out the name of a beneficiary and written over it HAMLETT SADLER. One of the witnesses to the Will is HAMNETT Sadler who spells his name correctly HAMNETT so someone evidently thought it would be as well to write HAMLETT to connect Shakspeare with the Plays. We also find an *interlineation* of bequests "to my fellowes, John



Heminge, Richard Burbage and Henry Cundell of 26/6 each to buy them rings." Here someone has thought it advisable to show the names Heminge and Cundell, the two actors who signed the dedication to the First Folio, and the name of Richard Burbage who built the first theatre in England.

But for these *interlineations* there is nothing whatever in the Will to show that Shakspeare was in any way acquainted or connected with plays or play actors.

The man who "doctored" the Will was probably John Payne Collier who perpetrated numerous and daring forgeries in connection with "Shakespeare."

The following is another example of a "Collier" forgery. In the archives of the Record Office is a patent granted by King James to certain actors *who are named* "to provide and bring up a convenient number of children who shall be called the children of Her Majesty's Revels"—the words on the patent being "Know ye that we by these presents do authorise and appoint Robert Dahorne, Phillip Rossitor, John Tarbuck, Richard Jones and Robert Browne from tyme to tyme to provide Keepe and bring upp a convenient number of children and them to practise and exercise in the quality of playing by the name of Children of the Revels of the Queen", etc.

Collier forged a copy of this Patent altering the names of the Actors to Robert Dahorne, *William Shakespeare*, Nathaniel Field and Edward Kirkham. He gambled on the fact that it was extremely unlikely that anyone would take the trouble to inspect the *original* Patent in the Record Office and discover his forgery.

# SHAKESPEARE AND ITALY

## PART II

By R. J. W. GENTRY

IT is not only in the realm of language and literature that Shakespeare reveals his love of Italy and his indebtedness to her for the inspiration of his most beautiful lyrical passages. He shows some special knowledge of the land itself, of its history and of its customs. In *The Taming of the Shrew* he makes Lucentio (i. i) speak of the 'great desire' he had 'To see fair Padua, nursery of arts' and that he had arrived 'for fruitful Lombardy, The pleasant garden of great Italy'. Shakespeare knew that Padua possessed a famous university, and was under the protection of Venice, whereas Mantua was not.

'Tis death for any one in Mantua  
To come to Padua. Know you not the cause?  
Your ships are stayed at Venice, and the duke,  
For private quarrel 'twixt your duke and him,  
Hath published and proclaimed it openly.

As Horatio Brown remarks: ". . . It was surely not a little for a London play-actor to know so much of the complicated political geography of Italy!"

Young patricians of Venice understood that a university degree was an essential qualification of an ambassador. Those who had gained one occupied benches of honour in the Great Council. In *The Merchant of Venice* the Duke says he will dismiss the Court unless Bellario, "a learned Doctor of Padua" arrive. This is in accord with the reputation for learning attained by that University, whose degrees were the only ones recognized by the Venetian authorities.

The Rialto, the famous bridge which links the two halves of Venice with a stone band, was the centre of financial business; hence it was the most likely place where Shylock 'many a time and oft' would meet Antonio. In the nearby *Campo San Giacomo di Rialto* is a kneeling stone figure, supporting on his hunched back the spiral staircase of a little sixteenth-century pulpit from which in the old days the laws and decrees of the Republic were promulgated. This figure is known as the Gobbio of the Rialto. Shakespeare must have known this was a distinctly Venetian name; and, incidentally, when he makes Old Gobbo bring a dish of pigeons for his son's master, he is making the old man conform with a Venetian custom.

When Brabantio calls for some "special officers of night," this would seem to show that Shakespeare was aware of the peculiar title of the city's night patrol, who were called *Signori di Notte*.

Even in the detail of Portia's hair (her "sunny locks hang on her temples like a golden fleece") he is depicting one of the true Venetian type, with red-gold hair, made famous by Titian.



Regarding Shylock, there are two particular points of interest. He recalls, in his misery, his business transactions in the city of Frankfurt, and the diamond he bought there. Was Shakespeare aware, then, of the great German Exchange-House, and that commercial relations between Venice and Germany were of the closest kind? Shylock's confidence that he will receive pure justice from the Venetian court of law is well-founded upon the fact of the Republic's most honourable reputation. Antonio recognizes this when he says:

The duke cannot deny the course of law;  
For the commodity that strangers have  
With us in Venice, if it be denied,  
Will much impeach the justice of his state;  
Since that the trade and profit of the city  
Consisteth of all nations.

The cosmopolitan character of Venice and the secure protection she always afforded strangers, both to their persons and to their commercial rights and goods, accounted for the high regard in which she was held by all who had recourse to her.

An observance, in *Romeo and Juliet*, that seems extraordinary is noted by Mr. Eagle. When Juliet asks Friar Laurence, "Shall I come again to evening Mass?" we might well consider that it is not customary in the Catholic Church to celebrate *evening* Masses; but it has been discovered that these were actually in use in Italy at that time, especially at Verona, where the scene is laid. In Venice the first Easter Mass was celebrated on the evening of Holy Saturday. The Venetians reckoned time from the Ave Maria; consequently Sunday began immediately after sunset; Capulet invites guests for an evening's festivities, which, as the drama shows, take place on a Sunday. This was a favourite evening for festivities in Latin countries, since the Holy Day would really finish at sunset. Juliet is to be married to the Count Paris at St. Peter's Church. There actually is a St. Peter's Church in the Via San Fermo, close to the Capulet house!

The remarkable form of betrothal of Petruchio and Katharina (namely, that her father joins their hands in the presence of two witnesses) was not English in form, but *peculiarly* Italian. And Petruchio says, "I will to Venice to buy apparel 'gainst the wedding day." It was customary for gentlefolk in the province of Veneto to go to Venice for their wedding outfits.

Special attention was long ago directed to this speech of Gremio at the end of the Second Act:

First, as you know, my house within the city  
Is richly furnished with plate and gold:  
Basins and ewers to lave her dainty hands;  
My hangings all of Tyrian tapestry:  
In ivory coffers I have stuff'd my crowns;  
In cypress chests my arras counterpoints,  
Costly apparel, tents, and canopies,  
Fine linen, Turkey cushions boss'd with pearl,

Valance of Venice gold in needle-work,  
 Pewter and brass, and all things that belong  
 To house or housekeeping.

Such luxurious and artistic objects would be seen in the palaces of Italian nobles quite commonly, but they would hardly be found in England, where living standards, even among the aristocracy, were considerably lower.

In the "Induction" a Lord says to the tinker, Sly:

We'll show thee Io as she was a maid  
 And how she was beguiled and surpris'd,  
 As lively painted as the deed was done.

Karl Elze urged that Shakespeare had seen Corregio's famous picture of *Jupiter and Io*. From 1585 to 1600 the picture was in the palace of the sculptor Leoni at Milan and was constantly viewed by travellers. Grillo says that Shakespeare "in several passages . . . gives the impression of being well acquainted with particular works of (Italian) Renaissance painters and sculptors. In *The Winter's Tale* he speaks enthusiastically of his contemporary, Giulio Romano, and describes the supposed statue of Hermione as the one conceived by that remarkable Italian artist, who was the renowned and perfect imitator of natural beauty. Giulio Romano is better known as a painter than as a sculptor; but in the earlier part of his life he devoted himself to sculpture; and although here the name of Michelangelo might have been more appropriately cited, Shakespeare is not guilty of ignorance or carelessness in associating with the name of Giulio Romano the supreme qualities of Italian Renaissance sculpture."

Another type of artistry altogether, the sinister skill in poisons for which Italians of that time had a reputation is hinted at in *Cymbeline*, where mention is made of "drug-damned Italy!"

Even details concerning a climatic peculiarity are not lost on Shakespeare. In *The Merchant of Venice* Portia says:

This night methinks is but the daylight sick—  
 It looks a little paler; 'tis a day  
 Such as the day is when the sun is hid.

Upon this Charles Knight remarks: "The light of the moon and stars in Italy is almost as yellow as the sunlight in England . . . Two hours after sunset, on the night of a new moon, we have seen so far over the lagunes that the light seemed only a *paler* day."

In the latter part of 1950 an interesting book was published in Italy—*Genio e mestre, Shakespeare e la commedia dell' arte*, by Valentina Capocci. Much of this book has received severe criticism in Italy itself; but it is conceded to be valuable in so far as it shows for the first time the close resemblance between certain Shakespearian scenes and traditional scenes of the *commedia dell' arte*.

It is said that the Italian method of declamation did much to cure what Molière called the "demoniacal tone" in the French players, some of whom actually sustained apoplexy on the stage itself as a



result of it! Hamlet's speech to the players contains such advice as would have been given by the Italian actors, with their emphasis on disciplined gesture and smooth delivery.

Sir Sidney Lee reiterated the argument from three well-known passages, the first in *The Tempest*, the second in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and the third in *The Taming of the Shrew* to show that Shakespeare was totally ignorant of the geography of the northern Italian provinces. But he sought, unwittingly, to prove that the poet was guilty of saying things which in fact he neither said nor thought. Professor Grillo deals with the argument very effectively: "It is erroneously repeated that Shakespeare described Verona as a city on the sea coast, and Bergamo as a place where canvas was woven for the making of sails, without considering that Shakespeare in his allusions to Verona was careful to mention not the sea but the very river—the Adige—which flows through that city; and that if he asserts that Tranio's father followed the trade of sail-maker in Bergamo he cannot have been far from the truth, for the city of Bergamo has been famous for that industry until recent times . . . In *The Tempest* Prospero relates how he had been taken out of the gates of Milan, put upon a ship and despatched some leagues to the sea. The poet's sole error here is in making the voyage too short; but even this is explained in the line:

'In few, they hurried us aboard a bark'.

The words 'in few' indicate that he has much else to say and cannot waste time in useless descriptions. 'In few' corresponds to the Italian 'in breve', which is sufficiently significant. In those days it was quite possible to embark at the gates of Milan for ports on the Adriatic Sea, and since in the sixteenth century there were no railways, a journey by river, canal or sea was often preferable to one by road because of its greater safety and comfort. . . . In *Two Gentlemen of Verona* Shakespeare describes Valentine as sailing from Verona to Milan. This is another passage quoted by critics to prove that Shakespeare's information was not the result of personal observation; but here also the accusation of ignorance is wholly unjustified. In *Romeo and Juliet* the city of Verona has no harbour and is said to be situated in the midst of the Venetian Plain, as in reality it is. From a superficial reading of *Two Gentlemen of Verona* one might think that the city was on the coast, since the word 'road' is used for the place of Valentine's embarkation, and several allusions are made to the ebb and flow of the tide. But such expressions do not necessarily indicate that the city was a seaport. It is true that 'road' is now only used of the sea, but in the sixteenth century and even much later it merely signified a place where ships could be anchored. Hundreds of examples from English authors prove that Shakespeare did not err, for the word is freely used in descriptions of towns on the River Thames. As for the ebb and flow of the waves, it is well known that the effects of the tide can be seen more than a hundred miles from the mouth of a river . . . The poet speaks not of the sea but of the river . . . 'If the river were dry'—what is this river? Without doubt the Adige, on whose banks Verona was built, a river

which, in the sixteenth century, had communications with many of the cities of northern Italy, including Milan."

Shakespeare knew certain land distances with amazing accuracy. The distance that Portia and Nerissa would have to travel from Montebello (*i.e.* "Belmont", just beyond Vicenza) to Padua is mentioned in the line:

'For we must measure *twenty miles* today.'

And, indeed, from Montebello to Padua is exactly *twenty miles*!

Some theorists have gone so far as to suggest that Shaksper picked up his information about Italy at the house of the Earl of Southampton, an Italianate Englishman. One of the literary men frequenting this house was Florio, a professor of Italian at Oxford, tutor to Prince Henry, and translator of Montaigne. Florio sought to popularize the literature of Italy among the Elizabethan courtiers. Alas for such theories, however; there is no evidence at all that Shaksper was ever anything like friendly with the Earl, or even met him.

The foregoing little pieces of evidence, if they are nothing else, are surely pointers to the fact that Shakespeare had a knowledge of Italy much more certain and out-of-the-way than he could have come by as the result of talk or hunting for it in books, if that were possible. No, it may well be sufficient simply to ponder these scattered observations for them to take on, I think, something very like the recordings of a direct personal experience of travel in the districts concerned. There is no ground at all for supposing that Shaksper had any such experience; but Shakespeare would seem to have visited and known Italy, as, according to George Brandes, *Bacon* did.

In view of what has been said of the playwright's knowledge of that wonderful country, almost certainly direct and personal, it is most important that we should have some authentic evidence that *Bacon* had such knowledge. The Rev. Walter Begley supplies this evidence in his *Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio* (Vol. III) where he tells us about Pierre Amboise, who, in 1631, prefaced his translations of some of Bacon's original manuscripts in his possession with 'A Discourse on the Life of Francis Bacon, Chancellor of England.' In this he writes: "Il employa dans les voyages quelques années de sa jeunesse, afin de polir son esprit, et façonner son jugement, par la pratique de toute sorte d'étrangers. La France, l'Italie et l'Espagne comme les nations les plus civilisées de tout le monde, furent celles où sa curiosité le porta . . ."

In addition, therefore, to all the other material demonstrating Bacon's authorship of the Plays, we have this vital piece of information that solves the mystery of Shakespeare's otherwise inexplicable knowledge of Italy and Italian literature.



## BOHEMIA'S SEACOAST IN *THE WINTER'S TALE*

By T. WRIGHT

RECENTLY, in the correspondence columns of the *Daily Telegraph* (26 and 31 May) there was again raised the controversy over Bohemia being given a sea-coast in the Shakespeare play *The Winter's Tale*. The first writer quoted Ben Jonson, Pope, Coleridge, Hazlitt and Saintsbury as criticising Shakespeare for having blundered in this; but, having seen F. W. Putzger's *Historischer Schul-Atlas* (Leipzig, 1905) which shows the kingdom of Bohemia as touching the Adriatic for a stretch of about forty-five miles and including Trieste from 1547 to 1648, he asks whether, after all, the author of the Play was right and the critics wrong. Further, he suggested that Robert Greene, whose *Pandosto* furnished the plot for *The Winter's Tale* and also included the sea-coast reference, was too well informed to make such a mistake. The second writer, a modern languages master at Westminster School, seemed to object to the desire to "exonerate Shakespeare from his famous geographical blunder," and accused the first writer of misreading his map; he suggested it was "just possible that Shakespeare (or Robert Greene for that matter), after a glance at a contemporary map or from hear-say" made the same error. To suggest that the world's greatest literature was produced under such haphazard conditions, is to indicate a lamentable lack of appreciation of the profound learning and extensive knowledge that the author must have had. He then went so far as to assert that "Bohemia was at all times nothing but the well-defined diamond-shaped territory surrounded by mountains on three of its sides." That diamond of territory could not, of course, push down the mountains which hemmed it in, and spread itself beyond; but the rule of the King of Bohemia could extend beyond those mountains, and the additional territories thus ruled over become known as his, as indeed was the case. The Play itself deals only with persons, not countries, and the two kings are spoken of in the names of their kingdoms, *e.g.* "Sicilia cannot show himself over-kind to Bohemia. They were trained together in their childhoods." The third and last writer was Prof. E. G. R. Taylor, who stated that, in Shakespeare's day, the king of Bohemia, Rudolph, was a Habsburg, and the territories which were subject to him included Carniola with a short length of Adriatic coastline. The professor added that she had more than once pointed this out to colleagues in the University English Department, but that, it seemed, the idea of Shakespeare having committed a blunder appealed to them as more romantic. The question, then, is asked, Could the author of the Play have been right, when he wrote of Bohemia having a sea-coast, and his critics have been wrong? We hope to show that the answer is decidedly "Yes," for very good reasons. It might be thought that the matter is not of sufficient importance to merit serious consideration. But in the early days of the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, the orthodox critic argued stoutly that the

all-wise Francis Bacon would not have made so stupid a blunder, whereas the man of Stratford-on-Avon was quite capable of doing so, and in fact did. Indeed, a strange argument: and, judging from the caption given to the correspondence in the *Daily Telegraph*—"When Shakespeare Blundered," one still advanced and needing refutation. But, what is of more importance is that, as we hope to show, it was the all-wise Francis Bacon who was responsible for this supposed stupidity, and, far from its being a blunder, it was historically true, and, moreover a matter of exceptional knowledge which could have been known only to a writer of Bacon's standing and experience.

The reader of the Play, can have no doubt as to Bohemia being represented as very much a seaside country. It opens in the island kingdom of Sicily, where the King of Bohemia has been staying for nine months as guest, and "my ships are ready," as he says, to take him back to his kingdom, to which he shortly goes. The scene for Act 3 scene iii is "Bohemia. A desert country near the sea." A ship from Sicily has arrived bearing a lord of that Court, who has been charged by the King of Sicily to convey the unwanted babe "to some remote and desert place, quite out of our dominions" and there leave it. The lord thinking the babe's mother to be dead, and believing the King of Bohemia to be its father, decides of his own volition to leave it "upon the earth of its right father." Having landed with the babe and a mariner, he asks the latter, "Thou are perfect then, our ship hath touch'd upon the deserts of Bohemia?" "Ay, my lord" replies the mariner who then returns to the ship: the lord, after depositing the babe, is killed by a bear: the ship is wrecked and lost with all hands. The babe is found by a shepherd whose sheep are "by the seaside, browsing on ivy," and is adopted by him as his daughter. The latter grown to sixteen years, her beauty attracts the attention of the Bohemian Prince, whose frequent absences from Court set the King questioning, especially as the Prince is reported as being "seldom from the house of a most homely shepherd." Later, there are sea passages from Bohemia to Sicily for the Prince with shepherd and adopted daughter, and for the King of Bohemia. One half of the Play's action is in "Bohemia. A desert country near the sea," where the King's Palace and Court, the shepherd's cottage and the actual seashore are all in close proximity. Clearly, the Bohemia sea-coast was no chance occurrence in the Play, but the author's deliberate plotting.

*The Winter's Tale* was licensed in 1611, but not published until 1623 when it appeared in the First Shakespeare Folio. There is record, however, of its having been played in 1611: once at the "Globe" and once at the Queen's Palace of Whitehall. All textbooks and commentators take it for granted that the Play was founded upon the novel *Pandosto* (later entitled "*Dorastus and Fawnia*") attributed to Robert Greene and first published in 1588. Certainly, the stories of both are practically identical. The names of the characters differ, and certain of the action is interchanged, but the differences found in the Play are, mainly, such as dramatization required. Indeed *The Winter's Tale* may well be regarded as *Pandosto* in dramatized form. But Robert Greene



and Will Shakspeare were contemporaries, without there being any evidence of liaison between them, and yet Greene makes no protest against such flagrant plagiarism. The orthodox critic also raises no objection to this, and we find P. G. Thomas, in his *Pandosto* (1907) saying—"It is no small tribute to Greene's literary skill that Shakspeare on many occasions adopted words or phrases from the novel, employing them often in wholly different contexts." The inferiority implied here is not borne out in a comparison of the two works, for this reveals a remarkable analogy of style, ethical treatment and moralization, which could not possibly have been due to mere copying in the Play. It becomes difficult to resist the conviction that the two works had a common author, and one having a far greater moral sense than it is possible to attribute to the reprobate Greene. It is instructive to compare the following two beautiful passages, spoken of the abandoned babe:

"Shalt thou have the whistling winds for thy lullaby and the salt sea foam instead of sweet milk?"

*Pandosto*

"The day frowns more and more: thour't like to have  
A lullaby too rough."

*The Winter's Tale*

P. G. Thomas draws attention to another work which carries the same motif as do *Pandosto* and *The Winter's Tale*, and also includes the expression "coast of Bohemia"; and that is Edward Ford's romance *The famous and pleasant History of Parismus, the valiant and renowned Prince of Bohemia* (1597). This also has the story of an abandoned child and a death by a bear. It is curious to note that the date of this romance is later than *Pandosto* and earlier than *The Winter's Tale*. *Pandosto* was very popular running into many editions, even beyond 1611, when *The Winter's Tale* was played at the "Globe." It is inconceivable that both works would be before the public at one time, even though Greene had been dead many years, and, it would be reasonable to assume that *The Winter's Tale* was tried out privately at the "Globe" performance, prior to its presentation before the Queen at Whitehall, and then was put by until being published in the 1623 Folio.

Two years after Will Shakspeare's death, Ben Jonson trudged to Edinburgh to be the guest of his friend William Drummond, and the latter made the following record of Jonson's "censuring of the English Poets . . . That Shaksper wanted Arte . . . Sheakspear in a play brought in a number of men saying that they suffered Shipwreck in Bohemia, wher yr is no Sea neer by some 100 miles." *The Winter's Tale* had not been published when Jonson said that, so he must have been present at the playing of it seven years before, or have heard of it. But the popular *Pandosto* (with its sea-coast reference) had been published thirty years, with Greene's name as author, and a third edition had recently been issued. Jonson, therefore, could not but have been familiar with it, and have known that Greene, its putative author,

<sup>1</sup>*Ben Jonson* by Herford and Simpson, 1925, pp. 133, 138.

first used the sea-coast setting; yet Jonson has no censure for Greene, and does not even mention him. Drummond wrote of Jonson that he was vindictive, sparing neither friend nor foe; and we may be sure that Jonson would not have spared Greene any more than he did Shakespeare, if the opportunity had offered. Clearly, Jonson did not associate the authorship of *Pandosto* with Greene, but rather with the mysterious "Shakespeare" whom he had been bitterly attacking for twenty years. He could not have thought this "Shakespeare" to be the man from Stratford-on-Avon, for several good reasons. About two years before the publication of *Pandosto* in 1588, the Stratford-on-Avon man had left his native town as an unlettered, uncultured provincial, to arrive unknown in London and become merged in the common crowd, gaining a livelihood as odd-man about the theatre. Thirteen years later, 1599, the Burbage brothers built the "Globe" and we find them stating that "to ourselves we joyned those deserving men Shakspeare, Hemings, Condall, Philips and others." Ten years further on, in 1609, the Burbage brothers bought the lease of the "Blackfriars" theatre and there "placed men players which were Hemings, Condall, Shakspeare, etc."<sup>2</sup> *The Winter's Tale* is adjudged to have been written the next year, 1610. Will Shakspeare of Stratford-on-Avon would then be at his prime; but the theatre owners employing him, place him no higher than third in their list of the "men players." Jonson had been attacking a dramatist, not an actor; and the difference between those two categories was a very definite one. Significantly, this was the last of Jonson's attacks on Shakespeare, and a radical change in his opinion took place. About that time he took up residence with Francis Bacon working on Latin translation for him, and editing the first Shakespeare Folio, 1623, in which, in the highest terms possible, he eulogizes the very man whom, so recently, he had been bitterly attacking. No longer is Shakespeare wanting in art, but "His Art does give the fashion"; he is the "Soul of the Age," "The Wonder of our Stage," "The Star of Poets"; in Comedy and Tragedy, he alone could be compared with all that Greece and Rome "sent forth, or since did from their ashes come"; and, incidentally, he includes in the Folio *The Winter's Tale* complete with Bohemia's sea-coast. The explanation for this remarkable *volte-face* is not far to seek. Jonson had come to see that his mysterious "Shakespeare" was no other than Francis Bacon, with whom he was now in constant association, translating his philosophical works and editing his Plays; of whom he was later to write—"I have and do reverence him for the greatness that was only proper to himself, in that he seemed to me ever by his works, one of the greatest men and most worthy of admiration that had been in many ages. In his adversity I ever prayed that God would give him strength, for greatness he could not want." The discerning reader of the <sup>3</sup>prefatory pages of the Folio will notice there the *double entendre* Jonson uses, to convey the hint that the real

<sup>2</sup>*The Greatest of Literary Problems*, J. P. Baxter, 1915, p. 52.

<sup>3</sup>Copies of the complete Folio may be seen at certain of the public reference libraries.



author's name was not "William Shakespeare," while maintaining the necessary secrecy.

But, to return to Bohemia's sea-coast. *The Winter's Tale* is a Comedy, and not a History. Had it been the latter, we would have expected to be able to identify the characters as actual personages in the history books. As Comedy, however, we see in it the "mere imitation of history such as might pass for real, only that it commonly exaggerates things beyond probability," as Francis Bacon describes Narrative Poesy in his *De Augmentis*. It is interesting to note that this quotation is from Spedding's translation of what Ben Jonson wrote in Latin for Francis Bacon. But that was after his conversion. Previously, had he not been blinded by malignant prejudice against the author of the play, of which he declared he would have hated himself had he been the author, he might have seen the Bohemian sea-coast reference to be merely an exaggeration of historical geography, even if he failed to understand that there was, indeed, a true historical basis for it. The kingdom of Bohemia was a Slavonic Power brought under German dominion in the 10th century. It came into the foreground of central European history at the time when the medieval Empire was gradually crumbling into small territorial states. Closely related legally with the German Empire it differed from all the principalities of that Empire in its characteristic nationality and its almost complete independence in internal affairs. Always a member though ever preserving its entity. In 1158 Bohemia was raised to the rank of a kingdom, following the creation of Austria as a Duchy. There then existed in Europe the Holy Roman Empire, which in theory, was the counterpart in civil government of the universal Catholic Church in religion, but, in practice, after 962 this Empire included only Germany and Italy, and a wavering connection with Lorraine, Burgundy, Switzerland and the Netherlands; Germany being the dominant Power. Again, in theory, the Holy Roman Empire was elective, and, later, in 1346, this principle was formally established and the hereditary right to elect was placed in an Electoral College of seven, including the King of Bohemia. In practice this heredity ran in princely houses or dynasties, as for example, the Luxemburg-Bohemian Line (1347-1437) followed by the Habsburgs (1438-1806).

In 1253 Ottokar II ascended the throne of Bohemia in succession to his father King Wenceslas, and, during his reign of twenty-five years, established a powerful dominion which included Austria, Styria, Carinthia and Carniola, in addition to some smaller possessions on the Adriatic. Reference to the excellent maps published with the *Cambridge Modern History Atlas*, will show that all these territories lay directly south of the southern frontier of the kingdom of Bohemia, linking the latter with the Adriatic sea-coast. So, certainly in the 13th century there was true historical basis for the Bohemian sea-coast in *The Winter's Tale*. It became proverbial that nothing could be done in the world without the help of God and of the King of Bohemia, and we may well believe that the name Bohemia 'ran' in the King's coastal territories on the Adriatic, and even lingered long after his dominion

there had passed. For Ottokar's great power was to be challenged as a threat against the Holy Roman Empire, and a campaign was launched against him. He was killed in battle in 1278, after which the great kingdom of Bohemia disintegrated, Austria, with its coastal dependencies, becoming the possession of the German, Rudolph of Habsburg, forbear of the ruling House of Habsburg, which was to become so powerful. In the 14th century, Bohemian kings of the Luxemburg line were also Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire and the kingdom became one of the most flourishing in Europe. The Hussite wars of the 15th century, which grew out of the religious teaching of John Huss, left the power of the kingdom greatly impaired. After 1526, Bohemia again became a possession of the Habsburgs, whose dominions already included Austria and its associated territories bordering the Adriatic. In 1575, Rudolph II was crowned King of Bohemia, becoming Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire in 1576; he died in 1612. It will be seen then that, at the times when *Pandosto* was published (1588) and *The Winter's Tale* was written (1610) the Kingdom of Bohemia was part of the Habsburgs' dominion which extended to the Adriatic sea-coast; at which times also, it should be noted, the capital of the Austrian monarchy was Prague in Bohemia. What use Bohemia made of the access to the sea-coast, thus secured, cannot be stated, but certain it is that the coast was spoken of as "Bohemia". When a London Alderman sent ships there, he spoke of them as going "to Bohemia." Even as late as 1654, we find Tschamer stating in the *Annals of the Barefooted Friars* that, in 1481, "fourteen pilgrims, after being attacked by Corsairs, landed at Bohemia." If, then, this use of the name Bohemia was prevalent when *Pandosto* was written, the author, having selected that particular section of sea-coast for the purposes of his plot, would, naturally, also so use it; and this would seem to be borne out by the commonplace manner in which he does so.

But there is also historical confirmation of another feature of the Play apart from the sea-coast, and that is, the brotherhood of the two kings, as hinted in the lines—"Sicilia cannot show himself over-kind to Bohemia. They were trained together in their childhoods." In 1486, Maximilian I, who had inherited Burgundy and the Netherlands, succeeded as King of Germany and Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, upon his father's renunciation of the government of his lands in his favour. In 1490, the County of Tirol was added to his possessions, and, upon his father's death, in 1493, he became the sole Ruler of Germany and head of the Habsburgs with their possessions. Maximilian's son Philip married Joanna, daughter of the King of Spain and heiress to the Throne. Philip died without succeeding to the Spanish Throne but left two sons, Charles and Ferdinand. Charles became King of Spain in 1516 upon the death of his grandfather on his mother's side, and King of Germany, on the death, in 1519 of his other grandfather. His brother Ferdinand became Archduke of Austria in 1519, and, having married the sister of the King of Hungary and Bohemia, in 1521, he was elected king of those two kingdoms in 1526, upon the male line of the Hungarian Royal House becoming extinct. In 1556,



Charles, presumably finding his greatly increased dominion too heavy a burden, abdicated his German kingship in favour of his brother Ferdinand; and the great Habsburg Empire then divided into the Spanish and Austrian branches. Charles's branch—the Spanish—included Sicily. Ferdinand's included all the territories linking the Adriatic coast with Bohemia, of which kingdom he was also king. Thus we see that, within fifty years of the writing of *The Winter's Tale*, there were two brother kings—of Sicily and Bohemia, as in the Play.

The author of *Pandosto* and *The Winter's Tale* did not blunder then when he gave Bohemia a sea-coast on the Adriatic, but rather revealed an intimate knowledge of the very complicated historical geography of Europe in the Middle Ages. How he gained that knowledge is a pertinent question. When *Pandosto* was published, England was only just emerging from the dark ignorance of the previous centuries, and happenings on the Continent would become known only to the comparative few: the printed book was still a novelty and the printed map very much so. It follows then, that such knowledge could have been acquired only by those in touch with the State's foreign interests, or those who had actually travelled the Continent and read its literature. The man from Stratford-on-Avon certainly did not fill that role, and there is no reason for believing that Greene did. Even supposing that Will Shakspeare could read and write, he was never in touch with State departments; and, according to his most generally accepted orthodox biographer, Sir Sidney Lee, he never went abroad. On the other hand, Francis Bacon was eminently fitted for the part. After coming down from Cambridge, at a time when the man of Stratford-on-Avon was still serving his apprenticeship as a butcher, he was, in 1576, sent by Queen Elizabeth to France in the entourage of the English ambassador at the Court of the French King, and there he continued until the death of his foster-father, Sir Nicholas Bacon. During a later visit to the Continent, a letter (Dec. 1582) was addressed to him by Sir Thomas Bodley, Gentleman Usher to the Queen's private apartments, exhorting him to study the arts of states and governments; and the results of that mission may be seen in Francis Bacon's *Of the State of Europe* which is included in Volume II of *Bacon's Works* published by A. Miller in 1765. Incidentally, Bacon emphasises in this, the "diseased state of the world", and goes on—"we do plainly see in the most countries of Christendom so unsound and shaken an estate as desireth the help of some great person to set together and join again the pieces assunder and out of joint." The work has every appearance of being the blue-print of a fuller report that would be submitted to the Queen or State Officials and would become a State paper. It deals with each State, including Bohemia and the several countries linking that kingdom with the sea-coast, setting out, in summary form, details such as the name of the Ruler; his age, family connections, marital state, "inclinations and qualities"; revenues, etc.; and, clearly, the information is such as could have been obtained only by personal enquiry on the spot. Within a few years of Francis Bacon's mission, there was published *Pandosto*, with its commonplace reference to Bohemia, which,

apart from poetic licence and local usage of the name, would not have been made by any ordinary writer, and, we suggest, only a writer having the knowledge such as Bacon's summary reveals. As we have seen, *Pandosto* was attributed to Robert Greene, but Francis Bacon states in his cipher writings of the true history of his times, that Greene and others sold to him their names for use as masks for his own writings, and in that portion of the cipher writings which has been deciphered from the Shakespeare Play *King Henry VIII* he states that he wrote "all Greene's wanton verses—those mixt poem-prose stories, wittilie having for our purpose Achilles or others as heroes—especially *Pandosto* . . ."⁴ We may, then, rule out Greene from our reckonings, and recognize the direct connection between Francis Bacon's mission to Europe and *Pandosto* and also see that Francis Bacon was the author of both *Pandosto* and *The Winter's Tale*.

Such then are the facts from which we conclude, that the provision of a sea-coast for Bohemia in *The Winter's Tale* was not due to the stupidity of Will Shakspeare of Stratford-on-Avon, but to the wisdom of Francis Bacon the true author of the Play, who knew there to be a true historical basis for such provision. It might be thought that the orthodox critic would have examined these facts, with a view to arriving at the truth; but, Gentle Reader, our literary pundits at school and university will not face up to facts which are likely to disturb their orthodox complacency, and, to their shame, they persist in the propagation of a belief which they must suspect to be a myth and delusion; and England's greatest Son is denied the honour and glory that are rightfully his.

⁴*The Bi-literal Cypher of Sir Francis Bacon* by E. W. Gallup, 1900, pp. 53, 181.



## GIFTS FROM ORTHODOXY. II.

By ARDEN

### PART II. *Bartholomew Fair*

FRANCIS BACON, ALICE BARNHAM and OTHERS

A consensus of Baconian opinion about Ben Jonson during the last fifty years can be tabulated as follows:

1. Ben Jonson's remarks in the dedication of the 1623 Folio of the Shakespeare Plays are ambiguous.
2. He thought very highly of Francis Bacon.
3. He despised the actor Shaksper and parodied that person in his plays.
4. He knew that Bacon was **Shakespeare**.
5. He was party to the mystery which surrounds **Shakespeare**.

Most Baconians will be familiar with the evidence and references which illustrate the above table so that it can stand as an introduction to this query. Since orthodox writers ignore such findings, how can we put the matter to the test? The best way surely, is to examine orthodox writings which involve a discussion of Jonson's plays and his allusions to **Shakespeare** and see whether or not such allusions point more to Francis Bacon than to the Stratford Man. Naturally, any such review will not always be to the liking of the Baconian, nevertheless orthodoxy is in no better position to seize on allusions to **Shakespeare** than is the Baconian. In fact, when we recall the domestic and social aspects of the contemporary scene, comparing Stratford with St. Albans, and the Bacon *milieu* with either the Stratfordian or the London theatre-world, the odds are that any allusion to the Actor will be coloured by the commonness of the scene, whilst any reference to Bacon should be clearer cut in the sense that Bacon's contemporaries were, in the main, above the ruck of common life.

Let us then, examine a work which extracts allusions to **Shakespeare** from the Jonson plays, and put our assumptions to the test. The work is *Shakespeare Revealed* by Leonard Dobbes (Skeffington, 1945).

First the proposition made by Dobbes in chapter III, which introduces the allusions to Shakespeare in Jonson's plays. Dobbes makes two such propositions and the second is:

"That Jonson replied to this . . ." (Shakespeare's satirizing of Jonson) ". . . by satirizing Shakespeare as **Justice Adam Overdo** in his comedy *Bartholomew Fair*."—1614.

Dobbes then proceeds to quote from the induction to the play which, he says, has allusions to *The Tempest*. Here are the lines which point to an individual:

"But these master-poets will have their own absurd courses; they

will be informed of nothing! No! an' some writer that I know had had but the penning o' this matter (*obviously Shakespeare*) he would have made you such a jig-a-jig you would have thought an earthquake had been in the Fair . . ." (Dobbes' italics).

Jonson refers twice to "Master-Poets", and the "writer" obviously belongs to this class of master-poets. From this it can be deduced that master-poets were not necessarily professional writers, since then Jonson would be tilting at his class. There is implied a superiority or difference in approach; hence Jonson's claim that such a setting in the Fair would be mis-handled.

If we accept the orthodox recognition of the *Tempest* allusions to *Bartholomew Fair*, for there seems little doubt about these, then we should expect Jonson to give a clear-cut allusion to the Actor from Stratford in an induction of over 200 lines. But, as Dobbes points out:

"The rest of the induction is taken up with an elaborate 'covenant' to be drawn between the author, who undertakes not to allegorize (as if Jonson could help allegorizing!) and the audience, who undertake not to harbour any 'state-de-cypherer' who might try to say 'what Mirror of Magistrates is meant by the justice,' etc."

Dobbes thinks that the justice is **Shakespeare** but when we list the references we find, instead of clear-cut allusions to the Stratford Man, the following: "master-poets", "state-de-cypherer", the "justice", and the "Mirror of Magistrates".

The bulk of the induction is couched in a pseudo-serious *legal* language, and the impression one gets is that Jonson was aiming his admonitions at one individual; a "Master-Poet" who would relish, or wilt under, the irony of an attack written in a parody of a style, full of familiar legal terms. We can leave the induction and its warning to the reader-playgoer *not* to see personalities hidden behind the characters of the play and return to Dobbes' theory that in **Justice Adam Overdo** we have **Shakespeare**. He enlarges afresh on this theme in Chapter VIII, tabulating his reasons thus:

(a) "The name Adam."

In brief: because "the dramatist" played the part of **Adam** himself in the play *As You Like It*.

(b) "The name Overdo."

In brief: because Shakespeare parodied all the literary fashions of his times by 'overdoing' them.

(c) "In the induction, Overdo is called 'this Mirror of Magistrates' . . ." and we are "reminded" . . of Hamlet's words:

" . . for anything so *overdone* is from the purpose of playing, whose end, both at first and now, was and is to hold as 'twere, the *mirror* up to nature."

(d) "Overdo is constantly talking of various 'disguises' which he had adopted to enable him to spy out 'enormity' in the Fair."

(e) "The presentation of Overdo as a 'justice'—one whose authority is respected by everyone in the play."

(a) It will be seen that Dobbes' reference to the part of **Adam**, listed as having been played by the Actor, is not necessarily an allusion to the Author. What is more, it leads to a difficulty present in the play *As You Like It*. By negative standards we should expect Overdo's first name to be William rather than a name borne by a Shakespeare character. Now in the play *As You Like It* there is a character named William! He appears in a short scene with the *Clown* in Act 5, Sc. 1. William is asked by the Clown: "Was't borne i' the the Forest here?" and the reply is, "Aye sir, I thank God." The "forest" is "Arden" as is indicated by a previous reference to "Robin Hood" and although we know that the Author adapts the source name "Ardennes", the introduction of a **William** "borne" there can only point to William of Stratford. Orthodoxy has long argued that the "Forest of Arden" indicated the Stratford Man. With a **William** in it the scene is well set. Let us see how the Author pictures himself.

The scene shows a country bumpkin: raising his hat to a *Clown*, being threatened by a *Clown*, being called a "clown", and, finally, being robbed of his woman **Audrey** by a *Clown*. William disappears, never to return, with a "god rest you merry sir." The orthodox writers have shown a singular disposition to forget "William" in *As You Like It* and the reason can only be because the scene is a paradox with the Stratford Man in mind as the Author. The Baconian will resolve the *impasse* according to the idea that the Author was alluding to the Stratford Actor. On common sense grounds then, it is doubtful if Dobbes is correct when he adduces that Adam Overdo is so named because Shaksper played the part of Adam in *As You Like It*. We are sustained in this by remembering that Jonson always portrayed himself (also the orthodox view) as a character with some pretence to dignity and wit and we can be certain that **Shakespeare** would do the same (*vide* Prospero in *The Tempest*). Furthermore we can now recall the so-called allusions to Shakespeare (the orthodox view), in *Every Man out of his Humour*. In that play we are referred to **Sogliardo**—"an essential fool"—"son of a farmer", and there is no doubt from any point of view that the Stratford Man is portrayed in the "toiling amongst the harrots" scene. There is a family likeness between **William** and **Sogliardo** and yet Dobbes asks us to recognise a 'respected justice' as an allusion to **Shakespeare** in one Jonson play and 'an essential fool' in another. The paradox can only be resolved by recognising the Baconian distinction that **Sogliardo** is not an allusion to **Shakespeare** but to Shaksper. Adam Overdo, therefore, cannot be a portrait of the Stratford Man but probably is of **Shakespeare**. The name "Adam" seems to be used by Jonson as something in the nature of *lèse-majesté*; a reminder to the 'master-poet' that he was, after all, a man with man's failings (*vide* the last scene of the play).

(b) We need have little quarrel with Dobbes over the name Overdo. The quotation from *Hamlet* is very apt but from the Baconian standpoint, it could be said that apart from the "parodying" of styles,



the second name could be an allusion to the constant revision of works, or to the borrowings of other works and plots so characteristic of Shakespeare's methods. The allusion in "overdo" would then be nearer to the meaning of to "do over" other men's works, a characteristic to which Jonson made open reference on several occasions with regard to **Shakespeare**; (*vide* the Epigramme on Poet-Ape). That we meet with the same characteristics in Bacon is too well known to need illustration just here.

(c) This Mirror of Magistrates. Here the allusion to Bacon is an obvious one and by no stretch of the imagination can it be associated with the Stratford Man. Since Dobbes uses the *Hamlet* lines under this heading it will be as well to quote Bacon on the idea of a "mirror held up to nature."

"And this comparison of the mind of a wise man to a glass is the more proper, because in a glass he can see his own image, together with the images of others, which the eye itself without a glass cannot do. But if the mind of a wise man is sufficiently large to observe and distinguish an infinite variety of dispositions and characters, it only remains to take care that the application be as various as the representation." *De Augmentis*, VIII, ii.

(d) The Disguises. The question must be put: how can "disguises" in any shape or form point to the Stratford Man? According to the orthodox view, Shaksper was an actor, was known as, lived as, and behaved like an actor; *vide* all the petty details of his known life and his associations. How then could Overdo's "disguises" for the purposes of 'discovering enormities' point to the actor? Jonson, according to Dobbes, is pointing to **Shakespeare** in the allusions to a 'master-poet', a 'state-de-cypherer', a 'justice', a 'mirror of Magistrates' who takes on 'disguises' the better to continue his *respected* activities.

Bacon is the only man who fits all these allusions. Jonson's other allusions to "Shakespeare" as an 'essential fool' bring in no hint of 'disguises'. Dobbes enlarges on this point about 'disguises' by suggesting that **Shakespeare** used his characters as "masks . . . through which the dramatist expressed his opinion of his contemporaries."

This may be so, but as the trick is common to most playwrights of the time, the 'disguises' of Jonson's Overdo must mean something quite different. Rather we are reminded at once that **Shakespeare** in Sonnet 76 uses the phrase "noted weed", in the sense that he used a disguise behind which to speak, and that Bacon in his will also used the phrase, "a despised weed", in the sense that in some sort of a disguise he had tried to procure the good of all men.

And as Archbishop Tenison tells us, "though his (Bacon's) name be not to it", we can tell his works by the 'design' and the 'way of colouring'—the strongest hint we have at anonymous and pseudonymous writings by Bacon.

(e) The Justice. Dobbes adduces that the 'respect' held for Adam Overdo by the other characters is a reflection of Jonson's acknowledgement of Shakespeare's . . . "predominant position in the

literary world." (p.201). He then goes on to speak of the disguises which are listed in Overdo's opening speech in Act 2, Sc. 1.:

"Well, in justice name, and the King's, and for the common-wealth! defy all the world, Adam Overdo, for a disguise and all story! . . . They may have seen many a fool in the habit of a justice (*an allusion to Justice Shallow*)?; but never till now, a justice in the habit of a fool. Thus must we do though, that wake for the public good . . . Never shall I enough commend a worthy worshipful man, sometime a capital member of this city, for his high wisdom in this point, who would take you the habit of a *porter*, now a *carman*, now a *dog-killer*, in this month of August; and *in the winter, a seller of tinder-boxes.*" (Dobbes' italics).

The speech is 57 lines long and is full of interest. One difficulty seems to be, whether it can be understood that Overdo means himself when referring to the "worthy worshipful man . . ."

Dobbes points out: "Now we have already heard of the disguise '*borrowed of a porter*' as one adopted by Overdo himself; so that we may safely regard all the others attributed in the above passage to 'a worshipful worthy man' as his also." Dobbes then deals with the 'habits' in turn. Now if Jonson had Bacon in mind, the allusions are very apt. Bacon was a "worthy worshipful man" who could . . .

" . . . entertain a country lord in the proper terms relating to hawks and dogs, and at another time out-cant a London chirurgion."  
(Osborn)

and

" . . . In his conversation he would assume the most differing characters and speak the language proper to each with a facility that was perfectly natural, for the dexterity of the habit concealed every appearance of art." (Mallet).

The characteristics of Overdo and Bacon seem to be identical in that they both could "take you the habit" of various types and speak their language. Who else but Bacon would it be, who so often declared that he had the "public good" at heart? The "justice in the habit of a fool" seems to be a hint at Bacon's well known love of a jest, and is an echo of Jonson's own recorded opinion of Bacon published in his *Timber: or Discoveries*.

Dobbes then proceeds to tie up the "habits" with the Shakespeare Plays, and the following tabulation shows his method:

*The Fool*: "The Fool in *Lear*."

*The Porter*: "The Porter in *Macbeth*."

*The Carman*: "Phaeton"—mentioned as one who guided "the heavenly car" in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*.

*The Dog-killer*: "Timon in *Timon of Athens*."

*A Seller of Tinderboxes*: "Autolycus in *A Winter's Tale*."

There is a large field for comment here and I think Dobbes is on the right lines. He deals with each 'disguise' in turn but is most doubtful about the "Carman" allusion. He quotes the lines from *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Act. 3, Sc. 1.

"Why Phaeton—for thou art Merop's son—  
Wilt then aspire to guide the heavenly car  
And with thy daring burn the world?"

It will be seen that these lines carry the same kind of admonition that we find in Jonson's induction to *Bartholomew Fair*. An admonition to someone who aspires to great things. Someone, who thinks himself a very Apollo! And was it not Bacon who was addressed as "Apollo" by his intimates and likened to Apollo in the *Manes*? Furthermore we may recall that little work, *Assizes Held in Parnassus*, where Bacon is titled "Chancellor of Parnassus," next to Apollo and above both Jonson and "Shakespeare." In the matter of the "Porter" Dobbes argues that Jonson was hinting at the Shakespearean mixture of high tragedy (*Macbeth*) and comic relief. Perhaps this is correct for there happens to be a surprising allusion in the Porter's speech to *Every Man out of his Humour* (1603). Let us see what the Porter does say:

*Porter:* Here's a knocking, indeed; if a man were porter of hell-gate, he should have old turning the key (Knock) knock, knock, knock, knock, who's there i' the name of Belzebub? *Here's a farmer that hanged himself on the expectation of plenty.* Come in time, have napkins enough about you: here you'll sweat for it . . ." (my italics).

Readers will find the reference dealt with by Edward James Castle in his *Shakespeare, Bacon, Jonson, and Greene—A Study*, p. 192. Here again, by Shakespeare is meant the Actor. For *Sogliardo* in *Every Man out of his Humour* is the "farmer" who tried to hang himself, "in the expectation of plenty." And since *Sogliardo* is a picture of Shaksper, the Stratford Man, Jonson's hint at a 'disguise' used by Overdo alludes both to the mixture of high tragedy and comedy, and to a personality other than Shakespeare the Author.

(to be continued)

**Editor's Note:** This article follows on Part I *The Justice from the Seven Ages of Man*, printed in *BACONIANA*, No. 147 (December 1953). We regret the delay, which has been caused by pressure on space. Part III will follow shortly.



# FRANCIS BACON'S UNACKNOWLEDGED DEBT TO THE SCHOOLMEN

## PART II

**P**ROFESSOR F. H. ANDERSON says in his Preface to *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon*

"It may . . . occur to the reader that an interpretation of Aristotle's three theoretical sciences according to successive grades of abstraction is not Aristotle's own, but rather one derived from Medieval Commentaries. Yet this traditional alignment is the one which Bacon has in mind when he criticises Aristotle."

He further says, in Chapter 10

"Not all his (Bacon's) statements concerning ancient Philosophers are accurate: and not many of them are unprejudiced for, generally speaking, he assesses the methods and conclusions of all thinkers in terms of philosophic naturalism. Aristotle he often interprets through the amplifications of the Schoolmen."

In Aphorism 4 of Book II of the *Novum Organum* Bacon says:

"This is our dictum and rule respecting a true and perfect idiom for knowledge that a nature be found convertible with a given nature and yet such as to be the limit of a more noscible nature like a real Genus."

Now in his reference to convertible terms in *De Augmentis*, Book VI Ch. 2, Bacon agreed not only with the accepted practice of the Schoolmen (an example being *Summa Theol.* Part I, Q. 16, Art. 3, namely "the True and Being" as convertible terms), but specifically with Peter Ramus when of him he says

"Ramus merited better a great deal in revising those excellent rules (*Axioms of Sciences Convertible*) that in obtruding one only method and Dichotomie . . . he had need set out in a lucky hour . . . that attempts to make axioms of sciences controvertible and yet withal not make them circular or retiring into themselves; notwithstanding we deny not, but that Ramus's intention in this kind is profitable."

In a "Letter and Discourse touching helps for the intellectual Powers to Henry Saville", Bacon includes Ramus for serious study but calls him a "lucky hole of ignorance" being unable, presumably, to forget he was a Scholastic! Yet Bacon also held with the Ramists, as Prof. Anderson (who holds no brief for Bacon's dependence on the Schoolmen) says, the "Rule of Truth that the established proposition must be true and of Prudence that the converse of a true axiom must be in a sense true. Bacon's view was that what is ultimately affirmed of an object is its identical nature." From a superficial reading of Professor Anderson's book it seems this is one of the isolated occasions on which he admits any influence of the Schools.

However since Bacon prefaced his remarks with "The unhappy case of Human Knowledge, as it is now, is even manifested by what is ordinarily asserted", it would seem he was agreeing with them when he said in Book II of the *Novum Organum*, Aphorism 2, "It is rightly laid down that true knowledge is knowledge by causes." In his Speculative Natural Philosophy or Inquisition of Causes, we find that Bacon follows the Aristotelian (*Metaphysics*, Book II) and Scholastic doctrine, which enumerated the Causes as follows:

1. Efficient Cause—that by which a thing is done.
2. Formal Cause—that which makes the thing what it is.
3. Material Cause—that out of which a thing is made.
4. Final Cause or motivating cause which may again be divided into Proximate and Ultimate Final Cause.

He specifies these causes, as already referred to, in Book II of *Novum Organum*, Aphorism 9, and it is to be noted that he again relates his ascquiescence, not to the Greek Philosopher but to the Schoolmen when he says in the *Advancement of Learning*

"... I do best allow of a division of that kind, though in more familiar and scholastical terms; namely that these be the two parts of natural philosophy, the inquisition of causes and the production of effects."

Continuing the above quotation from Book II *Novum Organum*, Bacon says

"Also the establishment of four causes is not bad, Material, Formal, Efficient, Final".

He goes on however to assert

"of these however the Final Cause is so far from profiting us that it even corrupts Knowledge except in Morals."

Now the Schoolmen (who especially in the teaching of St. Thomas related the Aristotelian Logic to Christianity) argued from the Final Cause synonymous with God (*Summa Theol.* Q.II, Art 3) whereas Bacon in the *De Augmentis* said "*Nam Causarum Finalium inquisitio sterilis est*". Macaulay and others have quite incorrectly assumed that thereby he repudiated God as the Final Cause of all things material and immaterial.

As however already pointed out Bacon was often indefinite in his expressions and it is reasonable therefore to contend that a similar laxity in his terminology resulted in his derogation by some of his contemporaries who dubbed him 'Atheist', and his misinterpretation by various modern critics. Rather, in fact, do his own writings substantiate the contention that he excluded the study of the Final Cause from Natural Philosophy but not from Natural Theology, or Morals as he said in the quotation given. Alternatively in denying the Final Cause as the premise in his Experimental Science (the object of which was the material benefit of man) he was excluding only the Proximate Final Cause and not the Ultimate Final Cause. Induction would necessarily exclude the former method.

Indeed Bacon insisted in the *Advancement of Learning* and also in *De Augmentis*, Book III, Chapter 2, that Natural Theology is

"a spark and rudiment of that knowledge concerning God; such as may be had by the light of Nature and the contemplation of the Creature: which Knowledge may be truly termed divine in respect of the Object and Natural in respect of the light".

In the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas, Part I, Q. 44, Art. 4, there is a discourse on "Whether God is the final cause of all things" which may be rendered syllogistically thus:

That which the First Cause intends to communicate to all things,  
and which all things intend to acquire is the end of all things.  
But the Divine Goodness is what God intends to communicate to  
all things and which all things intend to obtain  
Therefore the Divine Goodness is the end of all things.

It seems therefore that Bacon followed the Scholastic Logic in accepting God as the Final Cause, despite his remarks previously quoted.

In Bacon's Speculative Natural Philosophy therefore he conforms largely and indeed fundamentally to the Schoolmen's theories. His Operative Philosophy might be expected to be less likely to relate to Scholastic teaching. Actually however he owes much to Roger Bacon, whom he is presumably commending in Book I, Aphorism LXXX of *Novum Organum*. Roger Bacon was the first notable rebel against the traditional learning and the first Schoolman to advocate experiment to the exclusion of metaphysics. He proclaimed that it was wrong to argue from views already held and original research was the only way to true knowledge. He was not interested in Logic and like Francis Bacon he defined causes of ignorance, these being not dissimilar from the latter's Idols of the *Novum Organum*, namely

The example of frail and unsuited authority, comparable with  
Francis Bacon's Idols of the Tribe, or faulty human nature.  
Custom, which is similar to the hampering by individual conventions described in Bacon's Idols of the Cave.  
Opinion of the unlearned crowd, corresponding with the Idols of the Market Place, empty controversies, and  
Concealment of one's ignorance in a display of apparent wisdom, denounced by Francis Bacon in the vain theories of the Idols of the Theatre.

The later Bacon seems definitely to have followed the earlier here, and was also anticipated by him in the valuing of experiment more than discussion as a source of knowledge.

In this the Franciscan was unlike the later Dominican St. Albert the Great, who whilst a great scientist and experimenter (having discovered the splitting up of light thus making the later spectrum possible) was orthodox in his philosophy and was the teacher of St. Thomas Aquinas. Even Professor Anderson admits that Francis Bacon quoted from *Albertus Magnus*.

Francis Bacon was therefore by no means the first to emphasise



the importance of experiment as a means to knowledge, the inductive system having already been tried although not promulgated to the same extent. He may well have been inspired not only by the fact that these two men of universal learning had so interested themselves in physical sciences, but also by another Franciscan, Duns Scotus, a moderate realist as Professor Bertrand Russell calls him. Duns Scotus (as he says) was mainly interested in evidence, or the kinds of things that can be known by proof, namely principles known by themselves, things known by experience, and human actions.

It will be seen therefore that in his Natural Philosophy Francis Bacon defended against the Idealists the existence of an external world and against the Sceptics the fact of sense perception, this having been indicated on page 2 as the initial part of the outline of Scholastic Philosophy.

*(to be continued)*

## SOME NOTES ON *BACONIANA*

IT may surprise our readers to know that the current issue of *BACONIANA* is number 150 of the Fourth Series. Mr. T. Wright has kindly written to point out that the original title was "Journal of the Bacon Society", and this remained true from 1886 to 1891, when eleven numbers were printed. The present name was adopted in May, 1892, since when we can tabulate the issues as follows:

*BACONIANA* Vol. I., Nos. 1 and 2 (May and October, 1892)  
Vol. I (New Series) May, 1893, No. 1 to  
Vol. X (October, 1902), No. 40.  
Vol. I. (Third Series) (January, 1903) No. 1 to date.

In all, therefore, there have now been 203 issues of the Society's magazine including the current number, a record of which we have every reason to be gratified, but not, of course, complacent.

No. 100 of the current Series appeared in July 1941, and thirteen years, therefore, have seen the production of fifty magazines. It is only recently that the title "Quarterly" has been dropped, for reasons of economy of which Members are well aware. Naturally the present Editorial Board hope, and I dare to say believe, that regular quarterly publications will, in due course, be resumed. Meanwhile it is clear that it would be little short of criminal to allow past contributions to fade into obscurity merely through the passage of time, and we propose, as opportunity permits, to reprint articles which appear to be of special interest.

The memory of recent articles on Cervantes will doubtless be fresh in Members' minds, and we reproduce below *Some Notes on Cervantes* from the July 1941 *BACONIANA*. Readers are referred to No. 147, page 105, and No. 144, page 150, for recent notes on this interesting subject. Next time, we hope to delve deeper into the past.

NOEL FERMOR

## SOME NOTES ON CERVANTES

By L. BIDDULPH

MIGUEL DE CERVANTES SAAVEDRA was born at Alcala de Henares in 1547, possibly on 29th September, St. Michael's Day, and baptized on 9th October following. His father practised as an apothecary earning a meagre living. There is no record of his attendance at the University of his native town, founded by Cardinal Ximenes, though he is said to have studied at that of Salamanca. He is also said to have exhibited a taste for poesy and dramatic composition at an early age.

His first appearance in print was in 1569, when he published a small volume of 6 pieces of very little merit. In 1570 we find him in the household of Cardinal Aquaviva who had been on a visit to Madrid the

preceding year. In 1571 he enlisted as a volunteer in Don John's expedition against the Turks and took part in the naval engagement at Lepanto where he received a wound disabling his left hand and other severe injuries. He subsequently served in other expeditions including that to the Levant, and in 1575 set out to return to Spain furnished with letters of commendation from his commanders to King Philip II. These letters however proved to be his undoing, for the ship *El Sol*, which was conveying him and other wounded soldiers to Spain, was captured by Algerine pirates on 26th September, 1575, who, finding the letters on Cervantes judged him to be a person of wealth and influence whose friends could pay a heavy ransom.

Cervantes remained a captive 5 years in Algiers, and was finally liberated on payment of a ransom of 500 gold ducats raised by the complete impoverishment of his widowed mother and sisters, aided by the generous assistance of some monks who devoted themselves to the task of liberating Christian captives. After his release Cervantes again joined the army and served in Portugal under the Duke of Alba's command and also in an expedition to the Azores. In 1584 he published a pastoral poem called "*Galatea*," and married a lady of small means but much respectability; Dona Catilina de Palacios y Salazar. From this time he is said to have devoted himself in order to earn a living to play writing. Of some 30 pieces he is supposed to have written only two survive. "*Los tratos de Argel*" (Manners of Algiers) and "*Numancia*." The first of these is described as a badly constructed and for the most part indifferently written play in 5 acts; an example of the wretched dramatic art in Spain before its regeneration by Lope de Vega. Its only interest lies in the picture it presents of the horrors of the life of a Christian captive in Algiers. The other play, "*Numancia*" is a description of the siege of Numantia by the Romans stuffed with horrors and described as utterly devoid of the requisites of dramatic art. He lived in Madrid till 1588, when having failed to earn a living by literary composition, he returned to Seville where he remained for 10 years.

From 1598 until 1602 when he settled in Valladolid, nothing is known of him, though it is assumed that he continued to act as tax collector. In any case he appears to have had the greatest difficulty in securing a meagre livelihood and on one if not two occasions he suffered imprisonment by reason of his inability to give a satisfactory account of monies entrusted to his care.

In 1604 the first part of *Don Quixote* was licensed at Madrid and printed there in the following year. In 1605 we find Cervantes also in Madrid; he remained there until 1616, the year of his death. During this latter period he is definitely known to have been employed by the Revenue Authorities.

He is reputed to have died on the 23rd April, the same day and year as William Shaksper of Stratford. It is a remarkable coincidence that these two twin Suns should as it were, have made their bows of Adieux to the literary world simultaneously.

The works of Cervantes are given as follows:—

(a) *Galatea* 1st part 1583.



- (b) *Espaniola Inglesa* 1611.
- (c) *Novelas Exemplares* 1613.
- (d) *Viaje de Parnaso* 1614.
- (e) 7 Comedies 1615 of which the present writer knows nothing.
- (f) The second part of *Don Quixote* was published in the same year.
- (g) Finally in 1616, the year of his death, he was engaged in writing a prose romance, *Persiles y Sigismunda*.

Cervantes' claim to be numbered amongst the Immortals rests solely on "*Don Quixote*." Now in the preface to the Reader prefixed to this work, Cervantes plainly states that he is the step-father only of "*Don Quixote*" although appearing as the father of it. In conjunction with this statement it is significant to note that he attached no value to this work. He considered his best work to be *Galatea*, and all his life his aim was to be counted as a great poet, a claim which was ridiculed by Lope de Vega the day-star of the dramatic literature of the Spanish renaissance and other literary men of his own age. This judgement has not altered with modern critics to-day in Spain.

Further, Cervantes is said to have declared that the Immortal History of *Don Quixote* was only a trifling composition written for amusement. However that may be, it is certain that he failed to recognise his own genius as stepfather of the Valorous Knight of *La Mancha*; which is peculiar, as Shakespeare, his great contemporary, was aware, more than any man, of his own immortality as a writer and did not hesitate to declare it in the Sonnets.

This attitude of Cervantes invites the attention of the curious reader and we shall now place before him some of the unnoticed or disregarded hints to be found in the early editions of *Don Quixote* both Spanish and English.

The best and corrected Spanish Edition was published in Madrid in the year 1608. A facsimile of this edition was printed in Barcelona in 1897 as well as of the second part originally published in Madrid in 1615 and it was to this facsimile that our attention was first directed by Mr. Walter Owen of Buenos Ayres, to whom the following discovery was due.

In the centre of the letterpress title of the 1608 Madrid edition there is a device, sometimes described as a printer's device. Enclosed in a square is a hooded falcon perched on a gloved hand issuing from a cloud; beneath the falcon is a couchant lion. Surrounding these emblems is an oval label carrying the Motto *SPERO LVCEM POST TENEBRAS*, ostensibly referring to the hooded falcon, "I hope for Light after the darkness" (shadows). Within the label and against the word *SPERO* and forming the lower part of the clouds is to be seen quite clearly the outline of a Hog complete with eye, line of bristles down the back and a curly tail; whilst beneath the belly of the hog and between the fore and hind legs is to be seen the face in profile of an elderly and rather ugly man. In the second part published in 1615 the same device is reproduced but the outline of the hog and face have been deleted thus proving that the figures were not accidental.

Students of the Tudor and Jacobean literature are well acquainted with the appearance of the Hog in unexpected places.

Page 1 is also of interest from the symbolic standpoint. The head-piece represents two Pans playing on two seven reeded pipes and crowned with what appears to be feathered head dresses, seated, one at each end of the head piece. There are also other curious symbols including two branches of olive (?). According to Francis St. Albans' interpretation Pan represents Universal Nature, which is a very appropriate emblem to place at the head of a work depicting the whole range of human nature with its weaknesses, its strength, its virtues and vices, its wisdom and follies, uttered by the lips of a madman and a clown. It strangely calls to mind similar combinations running through the Shakespeare plays.

There also appear to be numerical sigils based on the system of the Latin Cabala and others connecting the book with the secret literary society of the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross.

We will now turn to the first English version which appeared in 1612 under the name of T. Shelton as translator, of whom nothing is known and of whom it has been said "that he was one of those inspired Elizabethans who emerged out of nowhere to change foreign tongues into the noblest English and then vanished into the darkness again." It is not known when Shelton was born or when he died nor can he be certainly identified. According to the dedication to the Earl of Walden (afterwards Earl of Suffolk) the translation was made 5 or 6 years previous to the date of publication (1612) in the space of forty days under pressure from a dear friend and was then tossed aside and forgotten, until again being urged by other friends he consented to let it come to light provided they would peruse and amend the errors. Did that mean to unhood the Falcon? The printer apparently took the liberty of presenting it to the noble lord without the knowledge or sanction of Shelton, who professes confusion on account of its unworthiness but begs him to lend it a favourable countenance to animate the father of it to produce in time some worthier subject, etc. We do not learn, however, that Shelton ever fulfilled this project as no other works appeared with Shelton's name appended to them.

The second part appeared in 1620 with no name appended as translator and was dedicated to the Marquess of Buckingham, to whom in 1625 Francis St. Alban dedicated his complete volume of Essays. Several other versions of Don Quixote have appeared in English, notably those by Motteux, Jarvis and Smollet, but by common assent the version of Shelton in spite of its slightly archaic style is still considered to be the best on account of its free, natural sprightly and untrammelled style and language, reading more like an original composition than a translation and in many respects varying from the Spanish edition so that one is tempted to ask: which is the original, the Spanish or the English?

We have already noted the statements of Cervantes in the original preface (repeated in the English version) that he was not the father but only the stepfather of Don Quixote.

In Book 2 Part 1 we find this idea repeated where the nominal author (Cervantes) informs the reader that the real author is an Arabian Historiographer called Cid Hamet Benengeli, which might perhaps be rendered Lord Hamet the son of the Englishman or Sir Bacon the Englishman. This implication is supported by a passage dealing with the same Arabian (?) author in John Philip's version of 1687, which has many peculiar references in it. John Philips was a nephew of John Milton and brought up in his uncle's house, and was therefore likely to have been a member of the Rosy Cross Literary Society, and to have been acquainted with their secret methods of marking literature brought out under the Aegis of the Society and of identifying the true authors thereof.

To turn to our text: the author (Cervantes) describes how he found the manuscript containing the continuation of the history of Don Quixote in the market place of Toledo, bought it and arranged with a Moorish Jew to translate it into Spanish which he accomplished in a month and a half. This is a curious coincidence with the forty days which it took Shelton to translate the Spanish text into English.

At this point stress is laid on the fact that "Dulcinea del Toboso" so many times spoken of in this history, "had the best hand for powdering of pork (salting of Bacon) of any woman in all La Mancha." Is this a hint that the Spanish text was only a translation and that the true author was masking under the pen name of Cid Hamet Benengeli? He is brought into prominent notice several times in the course of the history. To recapitulate; the Preface to the Reader, the remarkable Frontispiece, and lastly the hints dropped throughout the book all tend to point to a concealed author and even hint at a greater literary name. In such a matter one cannot be dogmatic, but it seems that there remains much to be discovered with regard to the authorship of this famous Masterpiece.



## BOOK REVIEW

### IS IT VILE SLANDER?

BY A. J. CUMMINGS

In the summer of 1952 I met in a pleasant hotel on the Welsh coast a distinguished-looking gentleman who spent the greater part of his holiday in the writing-room apparently making out long and complicated reports.

I took him to be a public official working overtime.

"No," he said, "I am a lawyer, now engaged on decoding a Baconian cypher. For very many years I have been debunking Shakespeare."

Would he be writing a book on the subject? "Writing a book? I've already written 11 books."

He had made debunking Shakespeare a lifelong study. My new acquaintance was Mr. Edward D. Johnson, a Birmingham solicitor, perhaps the most determined living authority on the Baconian theory in particular and the great Shakespeare fraud in general.

When I got back to London I received some of this literature from Mr. Johnson.

#### NO BACON

Though I had never concerned myself, except casually, over the true authorship of the Shakespeare plays, and had always dismissed the cypher explanation as fanciful, since clever but misguided persons can dig out a cypher from almost any publication, Mr. Johnson's books, I confess, impressed me by their evidence of close research and by the apparent failure of any Shakespeare authority to refute him.

For year after year, it seems, this was a one-sided controversy in which Mr. Johnson's opponents have refused to stand up and fight.

(1) Was Shakespeare in truth just an ignorant countryman and then a second-rate actor? and (2) Does it matter anyway to this generation so long as we have in our possession the works of our greatest poet and dramatist?

A few days ago I received from Mr. Johnson his latest book—"Will Shakspeare of Stratford"—with his kind regards and a request to notice "that it does not mention Francis Bacon anywhere."

In this treatise Mr. Johnson sets out as shortly as possible the actual facts known about Shakespeare "apart from all surmise and wishful thinking."

It is certainly a devastating piece of analysis, beginning with a contemptuous but searching criticism of Sir Sidney Lee's loose account of "Will Shakspeare's lineage."

Mr. Johnson recites facts to persuade his readers that even Will's reputed birthplace is "a sham and a fraud," and he wants to

know who taught Will to read and write before going to the local grammar school "if he ever did so," since no boy was admitted to the school unless he could read and write.

His parents were both illiterate; so also were his two daughters.

The Shakespeare plays show us that the author, whoever he was, was a great noble and generous man, which is "quite inconsistent with what is known of the life of Will Shakspeare, a man who led a mean, uneventful and sordid life, without any record of a generous action or a noble deed . . ."

#### NO REGRETS

No single fact, he says, is recorded in the Stratford records concerning Will Shakspeare—Mr. Johnson always dismisses the Shakespeareans as the "Stratfordians"—to suggest that he was "other than a very common man."

This man, whose life "opens and ends in obscurity," this man of no education, this man who, even before leaving Stratford, "is supposed to have been writing marvellous plays, 36 altogether, all belonging to the supreme rank of literature, yet when he dies does not leave behind a book of any description or a copy of any of the plays he is supposed to have written."

If he wrote the plays, why did he not in his lifetime claim to be the author, and why did he not make some provision in his will for his family to obtain any benefit from them after his death?

If he wrote the plays, how is it that not one of the literary fraternity in London raised a cry of regret on his death? How is it that not one of them took the slightest notice of the death of the Stratford tradesman and retired actor?

#### NO LET-UP

I have presented you with only a few fragments to suggest the remorseless purpose with which Mr. Johnson pursues the "Stratfordians" and challenges them. He is uncannily clever and well-informed, far too clever in this historical controversy for the likes of me.

From the side-lines I should not care to be called upon to answer the challenge. Even the "Stratfordians" might hesitate, for to Stratford the commercial as well as the sentimental values would be at stake.

To discover the truth would be an exciting event even in this age of surging unease. But why can't Mr. Johnson and his fans

let the truth remain quietly at the bottom of the well? The author of Hamlet will always be Shakespeare, however incontestable Mr. Johnson's proof to the contrary.

[*World copyright*]



## CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

In the *Sunday Express* of 3 Oct., 1954, the following statement was attributed to the executive and "researcher" for the company distributing in America the film of the Shakespeare Play *Romeo and Juliet*:

"The Rank Organization haven't billed Shakespeare in their advertising. Neither will we. My researches convince me he didn't write the play. We are planning to bill it as '*Romeo and Juliet*—by Sir Francis Bacon'."

The following letter was addressed to the Editor of the *Sunday Express*, but remained unpublished and even unacknowledged:

Dear Sir,

"On Broadway it's *Romeo* — by Bacon"

Mr. Richard Condon is on safe ground legally in billing Francis Bacon as author of the Shakespeare play *Romeo and Juliet*. In 1916, the Selig Polyscope Co. of Chicago had prepared a series of films illustrating the life of William Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon, and others of the principal Shakespeare Plays. It so happened that, at that time, the Riverbank Co. were advertising the forthcoming publication of a book intended to prove that the author of the Plays and Poems was not the Stratford-on-Avon man, but no other than Francis Bacon. The President of the film company brought an action<sup>1</sup> in the Courts of the State of Illinois to restrain the Riverbank Co. from publishing the book, on the grounds that its contents were false and calculated prejudicially to affect the sale of the films; that the film business would be impaired; and that the fame of Shakespeare as author of all said works would be shattered. A temporary injunction restraining publication was granted, pending the hearing of the case. The latter occupied three weeks, and, at the Circuit Court of Cook Co., Illinois, Judge Tuthill found for the defendant, Col. Fabyan, President of the Riverbank Co., and later, there were awarded him damages in the sum of 5,000 dollars, for restraint of publication. The final item of this decision read—

"The Court further finds that the claim of the friends of Francis Bacon that he is the author of said works of Shakespeare, and the facts and circumstances in the real bibliography of the controversy over the question of authority and the proofs submitted herein convinced the Court that Francis Bacon is the author."

<sup>1</sup>Eighteen years later (1934) the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook Co., in a letter dated 30 April, 1934, informed a Mr. Ralph Wardlaw Gloag that the decision of 1916, above referred to, was, the same year, set aside, as the Executive Committee were of the opinion that the question of the authorship of the writings attributed to William Shakespeare was not properly before the Court. Be that as it may, a decision was nevertheless come to in a Court of Law by legal minds accustomed to weighing evidence both for and against, and the weight of that testimony cannot be ignored.

Should you, Sir, be sufficiently interested to print this, I do not think you need fear any action for libel. <sup>2</sup>In the *Birmingham Daily Post* during August 1947, a Birmingham solicitor, Edward D. Johnson, accused the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust of obtaining money by false pretences, and he invited Mr. Levi Fox, a director of it, to bring an action for libel. Of course, this challenge was ignored.

The witnesses before the Court included J. Phinney Baxter, author of *The Greatest of Literary Problems* and Mrs. E. W. Gallup, authoress of *The Bi-literal Cypher of Sir Francis Bacon*. In the Court's formal decision was the following—

"The Court further finds that by the published and acknowledged works of Francis Bacon there is given a cipher which Bacon devised in his early youth in Paris called the Biliteral cipher; that the witness Elizabeth Wells Gallup has applied the cipher according to the directions left by Francis Bacon, and has found that the name and character of Shakespeare were used as a



mask by Francis Bacon to publish philosophical facts, stories, and statements contributing to the literary renaissance in England which has been the glory of the world."

18 Oct., 1954

Yours faithfully,  
T. WRIGHT

<sup>1</sup>BACONIANA, No. 55 (1916) p. 162. <sup>2</sup>BACONIANA, No. 82 (1935), p. 33

<sup>3</sup>BACONIANA, No. 126 (1948), p. 2.

To the Editor BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

I have a suggestion for a cheap, and, I believe, effective form of publicity. What about a car badge? A suitable badge could be designed and sold to members at a reasonable price. Many would enquire what the badge was for and members would have an opportunity of introducing the matter to their friends, literature could be offered on loan or given and thus the objectives of the Society could be discussed amongst a wider circle. Here and there a new member could be obtained.

Yours truly,  
GEO. H. SMITH

**Editorial Note:** We are pleased to bring Mr. G. H. Smith's original idea to the notice of members. Our correspondent has sent two proposed drawings for the badges, both oval in shape. One consists of a profile portrait of Francis Bacon surrounded by the words "Member of the Francis Bacon Society": the other depicts an open book, surrounded by the words "Veritas est filia temporis" on the top and sides, and "Baconiana" underneath. We are inclined to think metal badges would be too costly to manufacture, but printed gummed paper ones might well be suitable. We would welcome suggestions, and would ask Members to write and tell us if they are prepared to co-operate. The advantages of publicity are too obvious to need pointing out.

To the Editor BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

#### AN INTERESTING FORGERY

In the Lehigh University of Research at Bethlehem, P.A., U.S.A., there is a copy of Haywardes *Henry IV* dated 1599. On the Title Page is a forged autograph of "William Shakespeare" and on the back of the Title Page is the following note. "FFROMME THYS LYTTLE BOOKE, I HAVE MADE MANYE NOTES THATTE BE PROFYTABLE FORRE MY PLAYES OF HENRYE THE FOURTHE AND RICHARDE THE SECONDE I DOO MUCHE COM-MENDE THE WRITERRE FOR THYS HISTORYE".

The extraordinary spelling of most of these words shows that this is a forgery.

We also find that the forger was quite unconscious of the chronological fact that *Richard II* was published in 1597 and Haywardes book was not published until two years later in 1599.

Yours faithfully,  
EDWARD D. JOHNSON

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

In his article "Francis Bacon, Part III" Mr. M. A. Witney writes of "the remaining years from 1621 till 1626" and "that Shakespeare's sonnet-diary was among the last of his tasks."

May I turn your attention to my letter in BACONIANA, No. 143, wherein I mean to have proved that Francis Bacon died at Stuttgart, 18th December, 1647: my opinion not being contradicted in BACONIANA?

In those twenty-one years Francis Bacon had the opportunity to edit many more books under other men's names, as I wrote to your editor August 12th, 1952, which letter was not inserted in BACONIANA.

There are photocopies in the Library of your Society, in the Library of the British Museum and in the Bodleian Library, from Mr. Speckman's booklet, *Francis Bacon und sein Tod in Stuttgart im Jahre 1647*.

I enclose too a copy of my letter of August 12th, 1952.

Dear Sir,

Now it can be accepted that Francis Bacon died at Stuttgart, December 18th, 1647, the question arises if the works in relation to him and printed between 1626 and 1647 were edited with or without his co-operation.

Of these works one of the most interesting is the *Histoire Naturelle de Mre. Francis Bacon*. In the licence to print the translator is said to be Pierre Amboise. It contains also a Life of Francis Bacon different on several heads from Rawley's *Life* (1657) and was printed in Paris in 1631.

Granville C. Cunningham in his *Bacon's Secret Disclosed in Contemporary Books* (1911) mentions *inter alia*.

Parts of the work are so intimate and so introspective that the thought has come to me that I was dealing, not with Pierre Amboise or with "D.M." but with Bacon's own *Apologia pro Vita Sua*.

Cunningham mentions further that Gilbert Wats, who brought out in 1640 the English version (or the original in English) of the nine books of the *Advancement of Learning* speaks in its preface of Pierre Amboise's *Historie Naturelle* and quotes from what he terms Amboise's "just and elegant discourse upon the life of our Author".

Cunningham also mentioned that in this edition is a long preface in English by Bacon himself, that has no counterpart in the Latin editions of 1623 and 1624 and was something quite new in the 1640 book.

For more indications your readers may be referred to Cunningham's book. It seems to me that both these works were edited with Bacon's co-operation.

Yours truly,

COUNT L. DE RANDWYCK

Aerdenhout, Holland  
68 Zandvoortweg.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Dear Sir,

#### CANONBURY "TOWER"

As Mr. Aspden (September 1954, p. 92) had failed to answer my enquiry in the previous issue of BACONIANA, as to when this ancient building was first entitled "*Canonbury Tower*," I addressed a query to *Notes and Queries* and this appeared in the October number

The editor has kindly allowed me to see in advance of publication a reply received from the Librarian of the Central Library, Islington, who writes:

"According to my records there is no evidence of any buildings on the site of Canonbury Tower before the 16th century. The date of erection was probably 1562. The whole of then South range of buildings was pulled down in 1770 and replaced by other buildings; some relics of the former Canonbury House buildings are still to be seen in houses in Canonbury Place and Alwyne Villas.

"The only extant portion of the original 16th century structure still standing with only slight alteration is the present Tower. A long range of buildings, probably stables, was pulled down c. 1840.

"As Mr. Eagle suggests, the Tower is only *part of what was a much larger mansion*; it has been designated as '*Canonbury Tower*,' since the late 19th century.

"A fuller account of the manor's history and successive alterations is contained in H. W. Fincham's *An Historical account of Canonbury Tower*, 1908."

There is no doubt, therefore, that "*Canonbury Tower*" used twice by Mrs. Gallup must be added to that lady's anachronisms. It should now be admitted that she wrote her stories from her own fertile imagination.

27 Avenue Road,  
Falmouth

Yours faithfully,

R. L. EAGLE